REPORT RESUMES

ED 012 723 UD 002 750

RESEARCH STUDY (A STUDY OF THE PROBLEMS OF INTEGRATION IN NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS SINCE 1955).
BY- BURNETT, NATHAN L. AND OTHERS
URBAN LEAGUE OF GREATER NEW YORK, N.Y.
PUB DATE SEP 63
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$5.00 125P.

DESCRIPTORS- *URBAN SCHOOLS, EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, *SCHOOL INTEGRATION, ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS, COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS, NEGROES, PUERTO RICANS, CLASS SIZE, ACHIEVEMENT, EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES, SCHOOL ZONING, CAUCASIANS, *EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES, RACIAL BALANCE, EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS, TABLES (DATA), *INTEGRATION STUDIES, OPEN ENROLLMENT, NEW YORK CITY, HIGHER HORIZONS, HUMAN RELATIONS UNIT, CENTRAL ZONING UNIT

THE STATUS OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES IN PREDOMINANTLY NEGRO AND PUERTO RICAN SCHOOLS IN NEW YORK CITY AND THE EXTENT OF INTEGRATION IN THE SCHOOL SYSTEM ARE REVIEWED IN THIS RESEARCH REPORT. THE DATA PRESENTED IN THE REPORT COVER THE PERIOD FROM 1955 TO 1963. THE DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS OF THE STUDY INCLUDES THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION--(1) A BRIEF HISTORY OF DESEGREGATION EFFORTS IN THE NEW YORK CITY SCHOOLS, (2) A DISCUSSION OF THE ISSUES OF PUBLIC EDUCATION AND EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES, (3) A DESCRIPTION OF FOUR PROGRAM DEVELOPMENTS AND A LISTING OF OTHERS, AND (4) A REPORT ON THE PRESENT CLASS SIZES, ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS, AND AVAILABLE SPECIAL SERVICES IN THE SCHOOLS. RECOMMENDATIONS ARE MADE FOR REVISING SOME OF THE PRACTICES IN THE SCHOOL SYSTEM TO AVOID WHAT ARE CONSIDERED TO BE ALARMING TRENDS. MOST OF THE FINDINGS OF THIS STUDY ARE PRESENTED IN THE APPENDIXES. (JL)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Ann

02750

Letter Sent
3/14/67
ww

ED012723

URBAN LEAGUE OF GREATER NEW YORK

RESEARCH STUDY

(A Study of the Problems of
Integration in New York City
Public Schools Since 1955)

SEPTEMBER 1963

UD 002 750

AV 68000

INFORMATION RETRIEVAL CENTER ON THE DISADVANTAGED
Ferkauf Graduate School of Education, Yeshiva University

Chairman City-wide Education Committee: Mrs. Ethel Schwabacher
Chairman Educational Research Committee: Dr. Isidore Chein,
New York University

Members: Dr. Kenneth Clark - City College, City University of N.Y.
Dr. Dan Dodson - New York University
Dr. Gordon Klopf - Teachers College, Columbia University
Dr. Charles Long - Bank Street College of Education

Produced by the Staff of the Educational Research Department, Urban League of Greater New York: P. Bertrand Phillips, James W. Morrison, Esther R. Clay, Carol L. Hill

Edited by: Nathan L. Burnett, Program Director

Volunteer Committee: Della Arnold, Elizabeth Green, Julius Ford, Thelma McMillan, Robert Davis, Morris Lounds, Jr., Victor Margolis, Johnny Parham, William Toles, Judith Phillips, Carl A. Fields, Barney Hendley, Beryl Noel, Pearl Johnson, Raphael Hendrix, Wilhelmina Pelham, Gladys Selby, Mercedes Cartier, Juanita West, Lura Spruill.

PREFACE

Many individuals and organizations have contributed to this study and are mentioned in various parts of the report. However, this study would have been impossible for the Urban League to undertake and complete, if it had not been for subsidization grants from the Field and the New York Foundations. The Trustees of these Foundations have proven time and time again that they are among the most far-sighted and socially sensitive groups in the educational field today. As better educational opportunities are developed for the Negro and Puerto Rican children of New York City, these Foundations can justly be listed as most influential forces in the initiation, development and final implementation of this progress.

INFORMATION RETRIEVAL CENTER ON THE DISADVANTAGED
Ferkauf Graduate School of Education, Yeshiva University

URBAN LEAGUE OF GREATER NEW YORK

OFFICERS

Frederick W. Richmond - President
Mrs. Sophia Y. Jacobs - Chairman
Dr. William H. Kilpatrick - Honorary President
William R. Hudgins - Vice President
Dr. Gardner C. Taylor - Vice President
Mrs. Carolyn Crusius - Secretary
Richard Brennan - Treasurer
Joseph E. Davis - Associate Treasurer
Whitman Knapp - General Counsel
Dr. Edward S. Lewis - Executive Director
Nathan L. Burnett - Program Director

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mrs. Catherine Alexander, Mrs. Edith Alexander, Dr. C. Aspanasa-Johnson, Hon. Sidney Asch, Mrs. Joyce Austin, William H. Baldwin, Comr. Samuel J. Battle, Hon. Abraham D. Beame, Robert S. Benjamin, Irving Berezin, Aaron Bonoff, Walter Branford, Irving Brodsky, Charles Buchanan, Judge John E. Cone, Herman E. Cooper, Rev. William J. Cullen, Nicholas DeMaria, Lloyd E. Dickens, Dr. Dan Dodson, Robert W. Dowling, Hon. James Felt, Mrs. Maude Gadsen, Harold R. Goldberg, Ewart Guinier, Abraham J. Gurevich, John Hammond, Jack B. Hornsby, Morris Iushewitz, Dr. Clara A. Kaiser, Theodore W. Kheel, Israel Laster, Philip Liebmann, Dr. Arthur Logan, Stanley H. Lowell, Comr. Robert J. Mangum, Hon. Millard L. Midonick, Joseph Monserrat, Michael M. Nisselson, Dr. Jeanne L. Noble, Harry Novik, Judge Myles A. Paige, Edward J. Pierce, Mrs. Sylvia Ravitch, Dr. Sandy F. Ray, Sidney Rivkin, Carl Ruff, Mrs. Leona G. Russell, Richard Sachs, William Sachs, Orville H. Schell, Jr., Chester W. Schmidt, David A. Schulte, Jr., Mrs. Ethel Schwabacher, Charles H. Silver, Louis Simon, Herbert Singer, Dr. Theodore P. Stent, Hope R. Stevens, Maceo A. Thomas, Mrs. Vivienne T. Wechter, Mandel R. Weiss, Mrs. Ruth Whitehead Whaley, Rev. Joshua O. Williams, Charles Winston.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword

I. Introduction

    A. Purpose
    B. Procedure
    C. Summary Statement

II. A Brief History of the Struggle for Desegregated Schools in New York City

III. Public Education and Equal Educational Opportunities

IV. Program Developments in the School System Since 1955

V. The Present Status of the X and Y Schools

    A. Class Size
    B. Special Services
    C. Achievement Levels

VI. Physical Facilities

Appendices

I. Introduction

This study is intended to review the problems and progress of what has happened on the integration scene in the New York City School System since 1955. That year the study titled The Status of Negro and Puerto Rican Children and Youth in the Public Schools, published by the Public Education Association, appeared. To date, no similar report has been released.

The context of this report must be considered in the light of public school education, its philosophy, aims, objectives and ultimate goals. It is suggested here that the basic values inherent in our public school system be reconsidered and some important determinations and decisions be made regarding the introduction and exposure to these values.

The Urban League of Greater New York sincerely feels that in spite of the dedicated and highly qualified persons at all levels in the public school system of New York City and their determined efforts to provide quality education for all children, the battle against "de facto" segregation in our school system, with its attendant ills, is being lost.

This study shows many trends that are alarming and its final recommendations are made in the hope of assisting school and board officials to immediately and drastically revise a vast and complex system that is completely outmoded and inadequate in this nuclear-space age.

The design has been developed as closely as possible along the lines of the original Public Education Association (P.E.A.) study in order to complete the significance of policies and changes in the school system since 1955.

The Urban League's study, like that of the P.E.A., was basically concerned with examining the status of educational opportunities received in schools overwhelmingly populated with (90% elementary and 85% junior high school) Negro and Puerto Rican children and the extent to which Negro and Puerto Rican children were being integrated into the school system.

As a result of the Commission on Integration's report and the various changes in the school system that were implemented as a result, as well as additional developments that have taken place, it was impossible to follow the two main section headings of the P.E.A. study: The Issue of Equal Educational Opportunity and the Issue of Zoning. These headings have become chapters in the present report.

This study is also designed (1) to assist in clearing up some of the public confusion and misconceptions related to the implementation of the Commission on Integration's Recommendations, and (2) to note some of the basic causes underlying the continuation and growth of "de facto" segregated schools.

This has also been planned as an objective and factual public report and its findings are so presented. The special commentaries and the final recommendations naturally reflect the policy position of the Urban League of Greater New York and certainly indicate a definite point of view.

The research staff is grateful for the very fine cooperation from the professional staff of the New York Public school system on every level. The researchers worked very closely with the professional staff Committee on Integration, the staff of the Educational Research and Statistics Department, and the staff of the Central Zoning and Human Relations Units. In addition, the selected principals to whom questionnaires were sent responded quickly and willingly as did the selected District Superintendents who were interviewed.

The report drew upon the following sources for data:

1. Data available in Board of Education files and research statistics.
2. Data available in published reports of Board of Education.
3. Data furnished by principals and assistant superintendents.
4. United States Census Reports.
5. Reports of observations made by research staff members and volunteers.
6. Data and information for the special commentaries comes from the above sources as well as from Urban League Borough Education Conferences, teacher contacts and interviews, and basic day-to-day community contacts.

This study compared the two types of schools in New York City described below:

1. Group "Y" schools on the elementary level composed 90% or more continental white students and on the junior high level, composed of 85% or more continental white students.

2. Group "X" schools on the elementary level composed of 90% or more Negro and Puerto Rican students and on the junior high level composed of 85% or more Negro and Puerto Rican students.

The "Y" and "X" schools have been matched so that 118 of the 207 "Y" elementary schools have been selected in order to equal the total number of "X" elementary schools. Correspondingly, 29 of 42 "Y" junior high schools were selected in order to match the total "X" group of 29. The tables below show the borough distribution of the Y and X schools.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS TABLE I

	BROOKLYN	BRONX	MANHATTAN	QUEENS	TOTAL
Group Y -	40 (13-PEA)	16(3-PEA)	33(0-PEA)	59(16-PEA)	118(32-PEA)
Group X -	41 (5-PEA)	26(4-PEA)	38(13-PEA)	13(4-PEA)	118(26-PEA)

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS TABLE II

	BROOKLYN	BRONX	MANHATTAN	QUEENS	TOTAL
Group Y -	12 (8-PEA)	4(0-PEA)	0(0-PEA)	14(3-PEA)	29(11-PEA)
Group X -	10 (0-PEA)	7(1-PEA)	10(4-PEA)	2(0-PEA)	29(5-PEA)

The tables show that 32 elementary and 11 junior high schools from the original P.E.A. study are included in the present Y school totals. There are 26 elementary and 5 junior high X schools remaining from the P.E.A. study totaling 74 P.E.A. schools out of the combined grouping of 294 schools in the present study. The other 52 P.E.A. schools have been discontinued, annexed, or changed their racial composition.

Special Census of School Population - Composition of Register
Elementary Schools Distribution by Borough
October 31, 1962

	Number of Pupils				Per Cent of Total Register			
Borough	Puerto Rican	Negro	Others	Total	Puerto Rican	Negro	Other	Total
Manhattan	35,053	41,579	23,617	100,249	35.0	41.5	23.5	100.0
Bronx	34,119	26,208	50,662	110,989	30.7	23.6	45.7	100.0
Brooklyn	39,062	64,278	116,254	219,594	17.8	29.3	52.9	100.0
Queens	2,653	24,920	102,659	130,232	2.0	19.1	78.9	100.0
Richmond	408	1,785	18,498	20,691	2.0	8.6	89.4	100.0
Total	111,295	158,770	311,690	581,755	19.1	27.3	53.6	100.0

Elementary Schools - September 30, 1957

	Number of Pupils				Per Cent of Total Register			
Borough	Puerto Rican	Negro	Others	Total	Puerto Rican	Negro	Other	Total
Manhattan	34,596	36,829	31,669	103,094	33.6	35.7	30.7	100.0
Bronx	23,211	17,606	61,904	102,721	22.6	17.1	60.3	100.0
Brooklyn	24,423	41,939	133,383	199,745	12.2	21.0	66.8	100.0
Queens	2,108	15,875	109,932	127,915	1.6	12.4	85.9	100.0
Richmond	357	1,495	19,092	20,944	1.7	7.1	91.2	100.0
Total	84,695	113,744	355,980	554,419	20.5	15.3	64.2	100.0

RACIALLY IMBALANCED ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS[1]

Per cent Negro and/or Puerto Rican	Manhattan	Brooklyn	Bronx	Queens	Richmond	City-Wide	Per-Cent[2]
100 - 90	38	41	26	13	-	118	21%
90 - 80	13	16	8	5	-	42	8%
80 - 70	8	12	1	3	-	24	5%
70 - 60	10	4	8	3	-	25	5%
60 - 50	5	4	6	2	1	18	4%
TOTAL	74	77	49	26	1	227	43%

1. Data obtained from The Central Zoning Unit of the Board of Education, October 31, 1962.

2. There are 578 Elementary Schools City-wide.

Racially Imbalanced Junior High Schools

Percent Negro &/Or Puerto Rican	Manhattan	Brooklyn	Bronx	Queens	Richmond	City-Wide	% of City-Wide Total
100-85	10	10	7	2	-	29	22%
85-75	1	4	3	-	-	8	6%
75-65	3	2	-		-	5	4%
65-50	6	4	3	1	-	14	10%
Total	20	20	13	3	-	56	42%

1. Data Obtained from the Central Zoning unit of the Board of Education, October 31, 1962.

2. There are 131 Junior High Schools.

It should be noted at this point, that this report would have been impossible for the Urban League to undertake and complete, if it had not been for a subsidization grant from Field Foundation and New York Foundation. The trustees of these Foundations have proven time and time again that they are among the most far-sighted and socially sensitive groups in the educational field today. As better educational opportunities are developed for the Negro and Puerto Rican children of New York City, these foundations can justly be listed as most influential forces in the initiation, development and final implementation of this progress.

The following summary is a sampling of data collected:

Factual Data: Three Selected Areas

I Number of schools housing a majority of Negro and Puerto Rican students

A. Since 1955 the number of elementary schools with enrollments of 90% or more Negro and Puerto Rican students increased from 42 to 118.

B. During this same period, the number of Junior high schools with enrollments of 85% or more Negroes and Puerto Ricans increased from 9 to 29.

C. One hundred and ninety-three of the elementary schools house 80% or more Negro and Puerto Rican students while 42 junior high schools enroll 75% or more Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

D. There are presently 235 elementary schools and 55 junior high schools with an ethnic balance of more than 50% Negro and Puerto Rican students.

II. Achievement Levels

Average test scores-reading

The basic fact that the Public Education Association study uncovered, regarding achievement data, was that the longer the Negro and Puerto Rican students continued in school, the lower their achievement level fell. That this is due to many factors both inside the school and out is clear and some of these will be explored in depth. However, a study of the current achievement data reveals the same trend as noted below:

	Group X Norms		Group Y Norms	
	1955	1962	1955	1962
3rd Grade	2.5	2.9	3.7	4.4
6th Grade	4.7	4.8	6.9	7.9
8th Grade	6.0	6.1	8.4	9.6

The chart above shows clearly that the gain of both groups was very close on the third grade level, just under a half grade gain for the X group and just over a half grade gain for the Y group. However, at the six grade level, the X group barely improved from 4.7 to 4.8, while the Y group improved a full grade from 6.9 to 7.9. Again at the 8th grade level the X group shows little if any gain, 6.0 to 6.1 and the Y group not only improved but went over the full grade improvement level 8.4 to 9.6.

When viewed from a total perspective, the figures show the X schools as being slightly more than a grade behind on the third grade level both in 1955 and in 1962. The six grade figures show that in 1955 the X schools were a little over two grades behind and in 1962 were over three grades in back of the Y schools. The eight grade data from 1955 shows the X schools almost 2½ grades behind and in 1962 exactly 3½ grades behind the average achievement of Y schools.

III. School Staffing

A major unsolved problem is the reluctance of new teachers to accept appointments or assignments to schools which they regard as difficult. Since many of the X schools have been informally classified as "difficult" by teacher groups, the staffing of X schools has often presented a greater problem than the staffing of Y schools.

However, even more startling than any of the facts above is the evidence that shows only 31 or 1% Negro teachers in 105 Y schools out of a teacher population of 5,424. Only one Puerto Rican teacher is to be found in these schools.

In 109 X schools, there are 1483 or 33% Negro teachers, 77 or 2% Puerto Rican teachers and 2930 or 65% white teachers.

SUMMARY STATEMENT

It was in 1857 that the Negroes began their struggle toward desegregation of the New York City public schools. In 1884, Governor Cleveland signed a bill abolishing all "colored schools" and demanding all schools open to all pupils "without regard to race...." In 1900 Governor Theodore Roosevelt reinforced the action of Governor Cleveland. During the same period acceleration developed in residential segregation laying the seed for the birth of ghettos in the United States. A "de facto" return to segregated schools was inevitable in New York City.

For a few years the detrimental consequences of segregated schools were counteracted by the cultural climate of the Negro Renaissance. From the 1930's to present, education of the Negro in the public schools of New York City has declined.

In 1954 the League asked Dr. Kenneth Clark to prepare a paper on the problems of "de facto" segregation in New York City schools. Soon after, the Intergroup Committee on New York Public Schools representing the Negro and Puerto Rican communities was organized by the Urban League of Greater New York. Dr. Clark's paper charged that "de facto" segregation was on the increase in New York City's public schools and that the quality of education the children in segregated schools received was continually deteriorating. The Public Education Association was asked by the Board of Education to conduct a study "for the purpose of aiding all concerned in the attainment of the ultimate goal: the completely integrated school". The same year the Board of Education authorized the establishment of the Commission on Integration. Three years ago a progress report dealing with implementation of the recommendations of the Commission was submitted to the Board of Education from the Superintendent of Schools. It noted changes and improvements in the school system since the time of an earlier report by the Commission on Integration.

Public education is founded upon the principle that public schools are "free to", "open to" and "representative of" all the people. This present study reveals the fact that there are presently 235 elementary schools and fifty-five junior high schools with an ethnic balance of more than 50% Negro and Puerto Rican students and 118 elementary and twenty-nine junior high schools have an ethnic balance of at least 90% and 85% respectively of Negro and Puerto Rican students.

In an attempt to adequately cope with the four most difficult and dominant characteristics of the New York City school population, namely, size, range, mobility and origin, the school system established or expanded an impressive number of special programs, most notably the Central Zoning Unit, Higher Horizons Program, All-Day Neighborhood Schools, additional school guidance counselors, Human Relations Unit, and Open Enrollment.

A substantial number of new schools have been built in segregated areas in direct conflict with the recommendations of the Commission on Integration. A survey of utilization figures taken from 1962 data shows that seventy-one "X" (schools with 90% or more Negro and Puerto Rican enrollment) elementary schools are over-utilized, or over the 100% level while only forty-two "Y" (schools with 90% or more white enrollment) elementary schools are in the same category. Similarly, in the junior high schools almost twice as many "X" as "Y" schools are over-utilized.

The 1955 Public Education Association study uncovered the fact that achievement levels among the Negro and Puerto Rican students decreased the longer they remained in school; e.g., the eighth grade data from 1955 shows "X" schools almost 2½ grades behind the "Y" school achievement level. In 1962 they were exactly 3½ grades behind.

Current figures show the number of substitute and inexperienced teachers in the "X" schools to be far greater than those in the "Y" schools. Some "X" schools have had as many as twenty-six per diem substitutes during a three month period. Faculty turnover in most "X" schools is at least double that of the "Y" schools. In 105 "Y" schools there are only 31 (1%) Negro teachers in a teacher population of 5,425. One Puerto Rican teacher works in these schools. In the "X" schools there are 1,483 (33%) Negro teachers, seventy-seven (two per cent) Puerto Rican teachers and 2,930 (65%) white teachers.

The Urban League's position concerning zoning is that more creative methods should be developed and those methods in use should be expanded, i.e., Open Enrollment, the Princeton Plan (or plans of that type), cross-districting, feeder school patterns in conveying white students into predominantly Negro and Puerto Rican populated schools.

The complete recommendations and time tables embodied in the conclusion of this report are presented with the conviction that they will bring a better life to millions as the City and the nation move closer toward the ideal of democracy for all its citizens.

II. History of the School Integration Fight In New York City

It is of interest to note that in 1857 the Negroes in New York City and the State of New York began a successful fight against segregation and discrimination in the public schools of the state. As a result of this fight, Grover Cleveland, Governor of the State of New York in 1884, signed a bill abolishing the remaining colored schools and providing that all schools be "open for the education of pupils for whom admission is sought without regard to race or color". In 1900, Governor Theodore Roosevelt reinforced the action of former Governor Cleveland by signing a bill which repealed the law which permitted communities in the state to establish separate schools for Negroes and insisted that no person shall be refused admission to or be excluded from any public school in the state on account of race or color. However, as late as 1950, the legislature passed a bill eliminating the words "colored schools" from a section of the New York State Education Code where they had remained for fifty years, though they had not been used legally.

The second stage in the history of the education of the Negro in New York can be dated from the beginning of the twentieth century up through the 1930's. During the early part of this period, Negroes were freely accepted in schools located in whatever area they happened to live. This, however, was a period in which there was accelerated development of residential segregation leading to the increase in racial ghettos. Schools which previously had rather mixed racial and national populations began to become increasingly more segregated. As Harlem became an exclusively Negro community, the schools became more and more segregated. There was, therefore, a "de facto" return to segregated schools. During the 1920's the detrimental consequences of segregated schools in New York City were not fully understood or felt for the following reasons: (1) because the process had not yet completed itself and, (2) because of the positive impact of the cultural climate and the presence of a small number of Negro and white teachers who assumed responsibility for teaching Negro youth with a sense of dedication and strong faith and belief in the educability of their students. The cultural climate of the twenties served as a positive influence in stimulating academic interest in large numbers of Negro youngsters attending Harlem public schools at that time.

The third stage in the education of the Negro in public schools in New York City may be dated from the 1930's up to the present. This may be viewed as a stage of educational decline. Documented evidence concerning the deterioration in physical facilities and instruction in the Harlem public schools may be found in Mayor LaGuardia's report on conditions in Harlem. This was a report which the Mayor of the City of New York requested Dr. Franklin Frazier to prepare in an attempt to understand the causes of the March 1935 riot. The education section of this report pinpoints the problems of deterioration, overcrowding, and inadequate general educational facilities which were common in the Harlem schools at that time.

The Urban League has had a leading role in the school integration picture for many years. It specifically consolidated its role as a leader in the fight for physical desegregation and meaningful integration of the New York City school system early in 1954. It was at this time that the League asked Dr. Kenneth Clark to prepare a paper on the problems of "de facto" segregation in the New York City schools. A few months later, the League organized the Intergroup Committee on New York's Public Schools. Dr. Edward S. Lewis, the League's executive director stated:

> "Because the Urban League of Greater New York felt that this was a problem for more than one organization we called a meeting in March, 1954 of organizations representing the Negro and Puerto Rican community to work together on this problem. These groups joined to form the Intergroup Committee on New York's Public Schools. Within six weeks after its founding, this group called a conference to discuss the complex problems relating to the existence of segregated schools in New York City. Representatives from 60 agencies and organizations attended an all-day conference, and, after spirited discussion, unanimously agreed on a program to strive to obtain for all of New York City's children the educational advantages of a racially integrated public school system. The delegates pledged themselves:
>
> 1. to alert the community to the serious consequences of segregated and inferior education provided for Negro and Puerto Rican children in New York City,
> 2. to urge the Board of Education to approve an objective study of the extent and nature of segregation in the City's schools,
> 3. to request the Board of Education to adopt a clear and positive integration policy

> with regard to all of the City's public schools."[1]

At the Urban League's annual dinner in June of 1954, Dr. Clark presented the paper the League had requested of him. He charged that "de facto" school segregation was on the increase in New York City's school system and that the quality of education received by the children in segregated schools was continually deteriorating. Colonel Arthur Levitt, then president of the Board of Education, and Mayor Robert Wagner shared the dais with Dr. Clark and were quite disturbed by these charges. Mayor Wagner immediately asked Dr. William Jansen, superintendent of schools, to remedy the situation. Colonel Levitt then requested the Public Education Association to conduct, "A full, impartial and objective inquiry into the status of the public school education of the Negro and Puerto Rican children in New York City". The Public Education Association, of which the Urban League is a member, accepted the assignment, delegated it to a committee headed by Mrs. Morris Shapiro (now a member of the Board of Education) and requested the assistance of the New York University Research Center For

---

[1] Edward S. Lewis, "New Panes For Glass Houses." American Unity, Vol. XV-No. 5, May-June, 1957, p. 5.

Human Relations in conducting the investigation.

Dr. Clark's specific questions included the following:

1. "How do schools in the Negro community, with predominantly or exclusively Negro children, compare with schools in other communities in New York City in the following areas:

    (a) physical facilities and equipment;

    (b) general educational standards;

    (c) auxiliary educational services such as health services, correctional classes, the number of classes for intellectually gifted children, and the number of classes for mentally retarded children;

    (d) pupil-teacher ratio, multiple sessions and other variables?

2. What, if any, is the type of vocational or educational guidance services offered to Negro children in the predominantly Negro schools?

3. Are there changes in academic standards of a school as the proportion of non-white students increase? If so, in what direction and what are the factors responsible?

4. Is there a relationship between the level of academic achievement of Negro students and the proportion of Negro students in a given school? Is there a greater discrepancy between intellectual potentiality and intellectual achievement of the Negro child in schools which are predominantly or exclusively Negro?

5. Is there a greater tendency for children from predominantly Negro schools to attend vocational and non-academic high schools? If so, what accounts for this?

6. Is there a tendency for Negro teachers to teach in schools with predominantly Negro students? If so, what accounts for this?

7. What are the attitudes of teachers toward teaching in schools which are predominantly Negro? What is the ratio of temporary and substitute teachers to permanent teachers in these schools?

8. What are the attitudes of the administrative officials toward schools which are predominantly Negro or schools which have an increasing Negro or Puerto Rican population?"

Dr. Clark called for a study in cooperation with the Board of Education, "to determine the extent and effects of 'de facto' segregation in the public schools of New York City's Harlem." He called also for "appropriate action" to modify the racial composition of all public schools and to break the trend toward increasing segregation.

These were specific aspects of "de facto" segregation, but Dr. Clark pointed out that beyond these "specifics" was the burning issue of the "psychological and sociological" damage done to the Negro and Puerto Rican children in creating "a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community", and to the white children in "generating a false sense of superiority, making it impossible to achieve a healthy adjustment in our democratic society".

Colonel Levitt noted this concept when he asked that the Public Education Association conduct this study "for the purpose of aiding all concerned in the attainment of the ultimate goal: the completely integrated school".

The P.E.A. then formulated the following statement of principle as a guideline in its investigation:

> "Racial segregation in our public schools, based on the concept of 'separate but equal' facilities, denies the basic right of every American child to equality of educational opportunity. As such, segregation strikes hard at the roots of democratic society".

A statement from the Supreme Court decision of 1954 was then quoted and the statement continued:

> "It remains for the American people to increase their efforts to wipe out segregation, illegal or 'de facto', until no trace of the blight remains in our educational system. In New York City, with its millions of inhabitants of every race, creed and color, it is especially important to investigate all reports of segregation and eliminate it where it is found to exist. This is a job for both our school authories and the community as a whole."

While the P.E.A. investigation was under way, the Board of Education in December 1954, approved a resolution authrizing the establishment of the Commission on Integration. This commission consisted of all of the members of the Board of Education, various civic and educational leaders, and the top professional staff members of the Board. The resolution included a policy and program statement to the Board to the effect that the Commission was to address itself to the task of studying and examining "the racial composition of the schools within our city in order to determine whether the conditions therein conform to (proper) standards; and to report the facts with recommendations for such other or further action as may be necessary or advisable to approach more closely the racially integrated school in all localities".

The resolution stressed the need of implementing a plan which would prevent the further development of racially segregated schools, and integrate the existing ones as quickly as possible. The basic premise underlying the resolution was "the understanding that racially homogeneous schools are educationally undesirable".

A summary of the findings of the Public Education Association study follows:

> The facilities in Group "X" schools were older and less adequate than those in Group "Y" schools. Group "X" buildings were older (43 years against 31), yet they were not so well maintained. There was less floor and playground space, and there were fewer special rooms.
>
> When tenure, probationary, and substitute status were used as measures of competency, Group "X" teachers were not as competent as Group "Y" teachers, since fewer of them were on tenure, and more of them had probationary or substitute status. Also, teacher turnover was more rapid in "X" schools. On the average "X" schools received more services than "Y" schools, and had more classes for retarded children, but fewer for bright children.
>
> Average pupil achievement, as reflected in standardized tests in reading and arithmetic, was considerably lower in "X" schools than in "Y" schools. The differences in achievement increased with the grade of the children.
>
> Of the city's 639 elementary schools, 445 (71%) enrolled either 90% or more Negro and Puerto Rican children, or 90% or more children of other ethnic origins, 41 elementary and 9 junior high schools were 90% or more Negro and Puerto Rican. In general, principles in zoning school districts ignored possibilities both of separation and of integration of ethnic groups. It was not overall school policy to encourage integration through zoning.

Three basic steps had thus been taken in the process toward integration of the New York public schools. A factual study had been made of the extent of segregation and the detrimental educational consequences associated with segregated education in this city showing the following:

1. Negro and Puerto Rican children attending racially homogeneous schools were severely handicapped in academic subjects.

2. they generally did not have teachers who were as well prepared as the teachers provided for the children in other schools.

3. this handicap had been reinforced by their being classified as intellectually inferior, on the average, through scores obtained from tests which require knowledge and skills which, for various reasons, they have not been taught adequately.

There had been a reaffirmation of the educational desirability of racially integrated schools and a statement of the determination of the Board of Education to work for the elimination of segregated schools. This statement came in the form of an official policy pronouncement prepared and issued by the Board of Education of the City of New York in December 1955.

A working Commission on Integration had been appointed by the Board of Education and had included members of the Board. This Commission on Integration was charged with the specific responsibility of studying the problems related to the solution of the dilemma of segregated schools and making specific recommendations for the solution of these problems.

The Commission on Integration was divided into six subcommissions as follows:

1. Zoning,
2. Educational Standards and Curriculum,
3. Guidance, Educational Stimulation and Placement,
4. Teachers Assignments and Personnel,
5. Community Relations and Information and
6. Physical Plant and Maintenance.

The sub-commissions presented formal recommendations to the Board of Education. Two reports, the one on zoning and the other on teachers assignments and personnel were subjected to a long period of delay and after many months of public hearings were finally accepted and approved by the Board of Education in February, 1957.

In June 1960, a progress report entitled, Toward Greater Opportunity, dealing with the implementation of recommendations of the Commission on Integration, was presented to the Board of Education from the superintendent of schools. This report noted changes and improvements made in the school system following the Commission on Integration's report. In 1961, a new Board of Education was appointed by Mayor Wagner following the dissolution of the former Board under action of the State Commissioner of Education. In April 1963, a new superintendent of schools was sworn into office. Many other events and occurrences have followed during the years succeeding the Public Education Association's report and are indeed a part of this history. However, most of them will be noted in subsequent chapters of this study.

III. The Meaning of Public Education and Equal Educational Opportunities

The Massachusetts school laws of 1642 and 1647 set three basic tenets for American public education. First, the laws required the local communities to establish elementary schools and gave them authority to tax in order to support such schools; second, the laws gave official backing and sanction to the idea and principle of public responsibility for the provision of elementary education. This meant that the public officials of the colony had the responsibility of providing education for all children; third, the educational efforts of the local authorities were fully supported by the authority of the colonial government which recognized educational welfare as a concern of the entire commonwealth, rather than only a local concern.

Though the way has been marked by deep and hostile struggles, the American public school system, with its underlying base of public support, has gained acceptance over the years and has arrived at a place of prominence among American institutions.

The next important step for public education was a determination of its purposes, processes, and goals. Though statements of educational goals and policies are numerous beyond count, there has never been clear-cut agreement among educators or among lay people as to the over-all goals of education.

The question raised here is as follows: is it educationally sound to consider the elimination of "de facto" segregated schools as a top "educational" priority? As one studies the history and literature of American public education it becomes quite clear that the answer is an unqualified "yes". The American public schools have always been agents of change. John S. Brubacher notes four basic social forces that have played an important part in the basic conceptualization of American public education, especially at the elementary level. Brubacher claims that these forces have tended to spotlight certain points of emphases and these in turn have influenced modification and reorientation of the curriculum.

Because the earliest elementary schools were formed directly out of the religious tradition of the colonies, the curriculum was dominated by a classical-theological emphasis.

Next came the vigorous American interest in trade, manufacturing and commerce. This caused the elementary curriculum to be revised so that one could learn the rudimentary skills necessary for a successful economic life. Business arithmetic, navigation and like courses became increasingly important as the public elementary school became the seed ground for American commercial, industrial, and technological advance.

Brubacher characterizes the third force as nationalism. This force was most clearly operative during the years between the civil war and the first world war. During this period, education became a conditioning force in the development of national loyalty, civic pride, and patriotism. American history, civics and economics became an integral part of the public elementary school curriculum.

Finally, Brubacher notes that the fourth force grew out of a modification and re-energizing of the nationalistic concept. Preparation for citizenship in a democracy became a fundamental part of the elementary school curriculum and purpose. The contemporary emphases are upon tolerance, cooperation, human dignity and over-all moralistic-democratic values. This major social influence has caused the elementary schools to change its programs, facilities and general philosophy in order to meet the crucial demands of the present.

One of the crucial educational tasks is to devise a public school program in which there is a balance between the subject-centered, child-centered and society-centered approaches. However, an even more critical educational task is to balance these three approaches with basic and complete physical desegregation in order that all children may learn to experience these concepts through interaction with one another and not just through the precarious system of intellectual exercise. If the school is to act as a transmitter of democratic values, there must be total physical desegregation in the school system or the students, to whom these values are taught, (regardless of race) will be unable to accept them as real and meaningful because of the lack of contact with students of other groups.

In summary, then, the public schools have been established as "free to", "open to" and "representative of" all the people. The fact is that the schools are not "representative of" all the people and therefore do not truly or even effectively transmit the basic tenets and values of democracy. In northern urban areas where the problem of "de facto" school segregation has baffled professional educators, it has become easy to say, "our system is desegregated" or "some of our schools are desegregated" and therefore a democratic school system exists. But it is wrongly used - integration is a process that means much more than the mere physical proximity of students of different races.

The basic premise here has to do with the perpetuation of democratic behavior expectations as they relate to the skills and critical thinking aspects of education. The mass of evidence would appear to show that democratic attitudes and behavior may be learned but cannot be internalized and acted upon without some early experience and interaction with the object or situation involved.

The respect for individual dignity loses meaning in a "de facto" segregated school, because the very absence of children of differing ethnic and racial backgrounds creates self and group-evaluations that tend to promote inferior and superior self-images negating the full realization of individual dignity.

The Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association noted six characteristics of democratic education which they deemed important to American democracy. These six characteristics are important considerations in relating the goals of education with the needs of America's public school students. They are as follows:

> "First, democratic education is devoted to the realization of the democratic faith.
>
> Second, it is marked by integrity and honesty in all relations.
>
> Third, it is sensitive and responsive to the changing conditions of life.
>
> Fourth, it is independent of the passions and narrowly partisan struggles of the moment.
>
> Fifth, it is sensitive and responsive to the changing hopes, ideals, and problems of the people.
>
> Sixth, it is free from the domination of private persons and groups."[2]

If the New York City school system is to integrate the above characteristics into its educational policies then it must make some very drastic revisions in its present thinking about the concept of neighborhood schools, and other factors that play a major role in perpetuating inequality of educational opportunities. Again, the Educational Policies Commission lists five principles related to the task of changing the "status quo" of the New York City school system.

---

[2] Educational Policies Commission, Policies for Education American Democracy, (Washington, D.C., National Education Association of the United States and the American Association of School Administrators, 1946), p. 136

> 1. "Public education is anchored in the history of American civilization and at any given moment operates within the accumulated heritage of that civilization.
>
> 2. Every system of thought and practice in education is formulated with some reference to the ideas and interests dominant or widely cherished in society at the time of its formulation.
>
> 3. Once created and systematized, any program of educational thought and practice takes on professional and institutional stereotypes, and tends to outlast even profound changes in the society in which it assumed its original shape.
>
> 4. Any restatement of educational objectives and responsibilities which is rooted in reality takes into account the nature of professional obligations and makes adjustments to cope with the major changes brought in society since the last general reckoning in education.
>
> 5. Any statement of educational objectives and responsibilities that is not merely theoretical involves a quest for the institutional forms and operating practices through which education can best attain its ends."[3]

Principles three and four are especially relevant to the New York City school system and Board of Education.

---

[3] Ibid, pp. 4 and 5

The design of an educational system that would move swiftly and surely toward totally desegregated schools and institute dynamic educational changes in the segregated schools while the process is under way is needed in New York City. Any such program would necessitate drastic changes in the current educational program and structure. One of the issues currently being raised has to do with the compulsory education laws and the need to challenge them in the courts if equal and excellent education cannot be provided for all children within a desegregated setting.

The difficulties are great, but it is impossible for the school system to continue to teach values of race and ethnic group cooperation, equality of opportunity, and respect for individual dignity within a segregated school or classroom. This great task is in full keeping and accord with the highest traditions of American public school education.

It is the school's task to provide children with the best documented facts available regarding all ethnic and racial groups. In addition, creative achievements of all groups must be made a part of the regular curriculum and special emphasis must be placed on Negro and Puerto Rican history, contributions and accomplishments.

However, the schools must also assist students to develop a high order of sensitivity to others and this can come only through the mutual respect and self-cultivation that comes from day to day experiences of learning, working, and playing together. The school's responsibility is clear. It must now take up the challenge!

The Commissioner of Education for the State of New York discussed racial imbalance in the schools as follows:

> "In contemporary America, race or color is unfortunately associated with status distinctions among groups of human beings. The public schools reflect this larger social fact in that the proportion of Negroes and whites in a given school is often associated with the status of the school. The educational quality and performance to be expected from that school are frequently expressed in terms of the racial complexion and general status assigned to the school.
>
> A cardinal principle, therefore, in the effective desegregation of a public school system is that all of the schools which comprise that system should have an equitable distribution of the various ethnic and cultural groups in the municipality or the school district.
>
> It is recognized that in some communities residential patterns and other factors may present serious obstacles to the attainment of racially balanced schools. This does not, however, relieve the school authorities of their responsibility for doing everything within their power, consistent with the principles of sound education, to achieve an equitable balance.[4]

---

[4] New York State Department of Education, Racial Imbalance in Schools, June 14, 1963. pp. 2-4.

IV. Developments In The School System Since 1955

Perhaps the best way to introduce this chapter is to utilize selected quotes from the New York state report on the Instructional Program In the Public Schools of New York City. This report notes some of the basic problems with which the New York City school system must cope.

> "No other public school system in the United States has been called upon to do the job in education that New York City has accepted as a matter of course for many years. The problems of budget, program, and diversity of pupil population that cause alarm elsewhere and make universal public education the great challenge that it is for American society, are merely brief shadows of those faced by New York City. Administrators, teachers and parents in other communities would do well to compare their present burdens with those borne daily by their fellow-professionals and fellow-citizens in the nation's greatest urban center.
>
> Unless the nature and extent of the problems imposed upon New York City schools by the unusual character of the metropolitan population and its living conditions are fully comprehended, the schools will be credited with far less than their due. The schools have moved mountains, because there are mountains to be moved. The fact that they have not moved them far enough or fast enough is a measure of the staggering problems they face, not of ineptitude, dereliction, or irresponsibility on the part of teachers, principals, and officials. There are thousands upon thousands of devoted, hard-working professionals in the New York City school system. They are struggling against incredible odds to provide education of high quality to children in their care. They need help, and they need it now, not ten years from now, because the problems are growing, not receding. In many ways, possibly in most ways, the future of the metropolis is being written in its classrooms today. Unless what is being done now is done better, and unless much, much more is done than is now being done, that future will be a bleak one in many respects.
>
> Four dominant characteristics of the New York City school population exert a commanding influence on what the school system is able to accomplish and what it actually does accomplish. These characteristics are size, range, mobility, and origin.

The school population is huge--1,004,265 children in the fall of 1961, or 35 percent of the total public school enrollment of New York State. Where it can be compared with any other school system, it is like the population of the State's largest cities rather than the suburbs, towns and villages. In New York State, however, these other cities--Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, Yonkers, and Albany--have a total of only 183,025 children enrolled in public schools. Thus, in the State of New York it is New York City and its schools that bear the burden of 85 percent of the city school population and the extraordinary problems of economic handicaps, overcrowding, and maladjustment that mark the big city of today. At nearly every turn, the school system is limited, and often discouraged, by its own stupendous size from simply getting things done, let alone from improving them.

Second only to size as a problem is the variation in scholastic aptitude among the pupils. It is far greater than that found among the population generally. Sixth grade intelligence test indicate a mean I.Q. of 99.8, which is about average for the United States, and the range is from below 70 to above 140. The magnitude of the task of providing for such a range of ability is increased, of course, by the large number of slow-learning and scholastically gifted pupils. Thus, in the sixth grade alone in 1960, there were 1,548 children with I.Q.'s of 140 or higher, and 3,658 with I.Q.'s of 70 or lower as measured by group mental ability tests. An additional complication of great significance arises from the relatively greater number of children at the lower end of the scale. Although the sixth grade tests did not include handicapped pupils or those in classes for the mentally retarded, a greater per cent of the pupils in New York City scored at an I.Q. of 89 or below than would be expected in a normal distribution. The effect of an unusual distribution of abilities may account in part for a strikingly high proportion of national scholarship awards to New York City pupils. At the same time, enormous and costly burdens are imposed on the central office in the need for differentiated teaching methods and materials.

A third problem is that of pupil mobility. In many New York schools the pupils are transients. Large numbers of children come and go, never staying in one school long enough to achieve a sense of identification. Inevitably, both they and their teachers come to regard their stay in a given school as a temporary thing, so apt to be fleeting in time as to make difficult a serious effort at teaching or learning. In 1959-60 for example, 39 per cent of all elementary school pupils changed schools. In Manhattan the proportion was even higher, 50 per cent. In that borough, 52 per cent of the schools experienced a turnover of half or more of their pupils within the year. Obviously, such a turnover makes difficult the proper organization and administration of the schools, and places a considerable strain on sequential instruction.

Perhaps the most important and challenging problem of all arises from what is known as the school population's ethnic heterogeneity, that is, its diverse racial and cultural origins. To a degree that is unmatched in the United States, New York City is operating a school system in which vast numbers of the enrolled pupils do not share a common culture. Either by color of skin, economic status, language, or foreign birth, and sometimes by all four, they are set apart from the white, middle-income culture that dominates education in many communities. Any school system that makes a serious effort to cope with group differences as widely separated as those in New York City assumes a great financial and professional burden."[1]

It was in the context of attempting to deal more effectively with the type of problems noted above, and specifically underscored by the Public Education Association study and the Commission on Integration, that the New York City school system established or strengthened and expanded the following programs and services:

1. Guidance Demonstration Project
2. Higher Horizons Program
3. N.E. (non-English speaking) Classes
4. N.E. Coordinators
5. E.I.P. (Early Identification and Prevention)
6. Career Guidance Program
7. Reading Clinics
    a. Reading Improvement Teachers
    b. Corrective Reading Teachers
8. All Day Neighborhood Schools
9. Operation More (Pilot Project on Personal and Group Services)

---

[1] James E. Allen, Jr., and Staff, The Instructional Program In the Public Schools of New York City (Albany, Cooperative Review Services, The State Education Department, The University of the State of New York, 1962). pp. 10-11.

10. Elementary School Orchestral Music
11. Junior High School Special Programs In Science, Mathematics, Language and Music
12. O.T.P.'s (Other Teaching Positions)
13. The School Volunteer Program (Originated by P.E.A.)
14. S.A.T.'s (Substitute Auxiliary Teachers)
15. 600 Schools
16. Elementary and Junior High School Guidance Counselors
17. Open Enrollment Program

The following new units and programs are especially related to the over-all integration program of the New York City school system and therefore their scope and responsibility will be briefly outlined:

1. Central Zoning Unit
2. Higher Horizons Program
3. Human Relations Unit
4. Open Enrollment Program

These units and programs are important in that they are innovations and are constantly in the public view and therefore receive both great praise and great blame. Even more important, however, is the fact that these operations, while contributing much to the process of desegregation, must have additional staff and more money in order to chart the new directions and goals for the New York City school system.

The Central Zoning Unit, which was created in September, 1957 and is responsible for the Open Enrollment program as well as actual zoning, is best described in the two excerpts from the Board of Education materials that follow:

Zoning - 1960 Report (Excerpts)

1. Aids to Integration

A comprehensive zoning plan was formulated by the superintendent of schools. It provided guide posts for the field superintendent as he propared his zoning proposals, established a set of criteria used by the Central Zoning Unit in determining the extent to which each field superintendent's zoning plan fitted into the city-wide pattern, and described procedures by which the objectives of racial integration might be reached. Integration became one of the six cardinal principles of zoning.

2. Coordinating and Effecting Zoning Proposals

Since 1957, the Central Zoning Unit has gradually, but consistently coordinated zoning plans to the twenty-five field superintendents. This became especially important in cases where these plans involved more than one assistant superintendent's school district. The Unit has made periodic reports to the superintendent of schools, indicating the progress and the status of plans for integration.

From September 1960 through September 1961, the Central Zoning Unit reviewed proposals of 24 assistant superintendents involving 213 schools and about 19,800 pupils.

From September 1961 through September 1962, the Unit reviewed the proposals of 18 superintendents affecting approximately 173 schools and over 10,500 pupils.

Since 1958 and in conjunction with field superintendents, it has effected the transfer of over 48,000 pupils from overcrowded to under utilized schools. Between the fall of 1960 and September 1962, under the Open Enrollment program, it has transferred approximately 9,000 elementary school pupils in grades K-1, 2nd, 3rd, 4th and junior high school pupils entering the 7th grade, to integrated schools.

For September 1962, it arranged with the High School Division the admission of 338 pupils to "out-of-district" high schools, improving thereby the ethnic balance in those schools and retarding the trend toward imbalance in other high schools.

3. Service to Parent Teacher and Community Groups

Each year since 1958 it has heard and adjusted on the average of 40 appeals from parent groups concerned over zoning proposals of field superintendents. Each year too, the assistant superintendent or members of his staff have appeared before more than 35 community groups, teachers in-service courses, or parent groups, to discuss the functioning of the Central Zoning Unit, its procedures and processes, and the problems of integration.

4. Records, Maps and Files

The Central Zoning Unit has kept a record of the ethnic composition of all public schools - elementary, junior and senior high schools, since 1957. Assistant superintendents' district maps are on file and are kept current. Borough maps on file indicate locations of schools within each borough. Others indicate peripheral areas. On still others, the ethnic composition of schools is graphically depicted. In its files is a map indicating the zone of each of the 709 elementary and junior high schools. These are revised during July and August for schools whose zones have been changed since the previous September.

A. ORGANIZATION (Of Central Zoning Unit)

The Central Zoning Unit has been given specific authority with relation to school boundary lines. The Unit staff consists of 13: one assistant superintendent, three teachers assigned, two civil engineering draftsmen statistician, an assistant statistician, a supervising clerk, a stenographer, a clerk, a typist, and a planner. The total budget allowance is approximately $100,000.

B. COOPERATION WITH COMMUNITY RELATIONS PERSONNEL

All of the professional employees of the Central Zoning Unit are well aware of the community relations aspects of the work they are doing. One of them, a former community coordinator, has been assigned specifically to the task of maintaining a liaison with the assistant superintendents in the districts, and with their community coordinators. This constant contact with field offices has been a great source of strength in the daily operations of the Central Zoning Unit. The liaison worker has been in direct charge of activities to promote and prepare for integration, such as the following:

solution of bussing problems,

supplying ethnic composition data on schools and residential areas,

advising with reference to site acquisition,

publicizing information as to the policies, programs, and progress of integration,

preparing communities for changes in ethnic composition of schools,

mobilizing public support for integration programs.

C. MAINTENANCE OF MAPS AND RECORDS

Each school is required to submit, each year, a copy of its zoning map. These maps, standardized as to form, date, and scale, are carefully reviewed and compared with the maps of the preceding year. As already indicated, no zone changes may be made without the knowledge and approval of the Central Zoning Unit. The Unit also collects and maintains data relating to the following: patterns of feeder schools; school ethnic population; degree of school utilization; site selection and districting for new schools; topographical characteristics; planned capital improvements having an impact on school utilization; and population trends. Ethnic distribution data have been mapped by borough, by distribution as to specific blocks of school districts, and, in some cases, by grade.[2]

1. Elementary School Open Enrollment

The Central Zoning Unit has completed the processing of 2900 elementary pupil applications for assignment to "receiving" schools in September, 1963. Based upon the number of seats available, all of these will be assigned to "receiving" schools. Judging from the drop-out rate experienced in September, 1961 and September, 1962, 2600 of these will probably register in their assigned schools in September, 1963.

2. Junior High School Open Enrollment

By the middle of March, the Unit will have completed the processing of 4570 applications for junior high school Open Enrollment placement. The comparatively few seats available in a constantly decreasing number of junior high schools which qualify as "receiving" schools, will limit sharply for September, 1963 the number of applicants placed. The number placed is expected to be approximately 1200. The upsurge in the number of pupils finishing the sixth grade in June, 1963, entering the seventh grade in September, coupled with a need for additional junior high schools (city-wide) are two of the factors restricting the number of assignments.

3. High School Variances

In cooperation with the High School Division, plans have been completed for diverting 650 Negro and Puerto Rican pupils finishing junior high school from three high schools in which the trend toward greater balance of ethnic groups has become pronounced, to other high schools.[3]

---

[2] John J. Theobald, and Staff, Toward Greater Opportunity - A progress report from the superintendent of schools of the Board of Education dealing with implementation of recommendations of the Commission on Integration - (New York Board of Education of the City of New York 1960), pp. 169-70.

[3] Frank Turner, et al., Report of the Committee on Integration Part 1 - Zoning - Human Relations - Teacher Personnel (New York, New York City Public Schools, 1963). pp. 1-3

2. HIGHER HORIZONS

The Higher Horizons program is one of the most well-known and widely patterned after programs of the New York City school system. This program evolved out of the Demonstration Guidance Project which was started in September, 1956 and ended June, 1962.

The primary purpose of the Demonstration Guidance Project was to identify and upgrade potential college students coming from a background of limited cultural contacts and generally low income families. This program grew out of the Integration Commission's Guidance, Educational Stimulation, and Placement recommendations for a pilot "Demonstration Guidance Program for the early identification and stimulation of able students...to overcome the stifling of educational motivation in children from families struggling economically and without an educational tradition..." The program was planned to reach these children before they reached the legal age for school leaving and so was organized at the junior high school level and continued into and through the high school. Junior High School 43 and George Washington High School were the schools chosen for the program. It provided for an expanded guidance and counseling program, special instructional and remedial assistance, new and dynamic parent education and involvement approaches, broader cultural contacts and experiences and clinical services and financial assistance as needed.

The basic differences between the Demonstration Guidance Project are best described by Jack Landers in his exceptionally fine report on the Higher Horizons Program.

"Although the Higher Horizons program was a direct outgrowth of the Demonstration Guidance Project, there are important differences between them with reference both to purposes and to organization.

The pilot project was designed to identify and stimulate able pupils, with the ultimate goal of college admission. The target group consisted initially of only one-half of the junior high school population, and the number of children continued in the project decreased for every year of operation. The Higher Horizons program includes all children in the grades affected, the academically disabled as well as the academically able. Because it embraces all pupils, its goals must of necessity be the goals of all education. Since it applies specifically to disadvantaged children, Higher Horizons is in reality a guest for the kind of education which, adjusted to their needs, will enable them to compete with other children on an equal basis, and to receive a fair share of the rewards of society.

As such, it has ceased to be a special project, and has become a program. It is no longer faced with the necessity of constantly justifying its existence. The methods, procedures, techniques, rationale, and emphases may change, and perhaps be altered completely; but the need will continue to exist. So long as there are large groups of children who are denied effective quality of educational opportunity, just so long will some form of Higher Horizons be necessary.

Originally, in 1959, Higher Horizons was introduced in grade three of elementary school and grade seven of junior high school. Each year, one elementary grade and one secondary grade have been added, so that at present the program includes elementary grades three to six, junior high school grades seven, eight, and nine, and grade ten in high school.

The reasons for beginning with one grade at a time were many. The introduction of so vast a program required time for planning, organization, and teacher training. The budgetary situation was such as to render difficult, if not impossible, appropriations for children in all grades in the selected schools. It was the general feeling that growth should be gradual, in order to facilitate the evaluation of progress as a preliminary to further expansion. Thus both financial and educational reasons joined to indicate the inclusion of one grade at a time."[4]

---

[4] Jacob Landers, Higher Horizons Progress Report, (New York, Board of Education for the City of New York, 1963) pp. 3-4.

The following tables from the Higher Horizons Progress Report give an indication of the services involved in the program.

Expansion of Elementary School Higher Horizons Services,
1959 -- 1962

Year	Schools	Grades	Pupils	Program Teachers	Counselors
1959-1960	31	3	5,561	33	30
1960-1961	52	3,4	18,342	61	49
1961-1962	52	3,4,5	25,039	81	67
1962-1963	52	3,4,5,6	33,757	168	87

Expansion of Jr. H.S. Higher Horizons Services, 1959-1962

Year	Schools	Grades	Pupils	Program Teachers	Counselors
1959-1960	13	7	6,769	25	26
1960-1961	13	7,8	13,423	32	29
1961-1962	13	7,8,9	19,111	46	50
1962-1963	13	7,8,9	19,338	52	50

> In September 1962, the tenth grade of 9 academic high schools and 2 vocational high schools was added to the program. In order to extend additional Higher Horizons services to the 10,980 pupils, 70 program teachers and 20 guidance counselors were added to the school staff over and beyond the normal allotment.[5]

[5] Ibid. P. 5.

The Higher Horizons Program is best summed up in the summary of its own progress report. (Specific comments regarding the program will appear in the recommendations. Additional information about the program will be found in the appendices.)

Summary:

"It would be a serious error to leave the impression that New York City has solved all of its educational problems through the Higher Horizons schools, as in other schools attended by disadvantaged children, there are too many pupils on part-time instruction and too many inexperienced teachers. The average achievement level is still far below that of other schools, and the gap between potential and performance is still great indeed.

The Higher Horizons Program does not pretend to be a panacea. It is a symbol of the efforts of a community on behalf of its children. It is a program of conspicuous, collective action to salvage the potential of children.

It is true that no single aspect or procedure of the Higher Horizons Program is brand new. There is nothing novel about trips, or parent workshops, or academic enrichment, or intensive individual counseling on any considerable scale to tap the hidden potential of our disadvantaged children.

Higher Horizons is an organized effort to effect a major breakthrough in the education of those who need special help to be able to make their maximum contribution to our American democracy. It has established the basic philosophy and indicated the major areas of operation. It inspires hope and supplies the personnel to translate that hope into reality. What might formerly have been done sporadically or in isolation is now part of a total program, with far greater impact upon the child. If Higher Horizons has done nothing else, it has provided a rallying point in the fight for our disadvantaged children, and a peg upon which all - supervisors, teachers, parents, and pupils - might hand their hopes."[6]

---

[6] Ibid. pp. 97-98.

The following description of the Human Relations Unit is taken from the report of the Committee on Integration, Part I:

HUMAN RELATIONS UNIT

A. PAST ACTIONS

The Human Relations Unit began operating at the beginning of the 1961-1962 school year. The following is a partial list of the activities in which it has engaged:

1. School-community:

   a. Working with the school-community coordinators to strengthen and extend and initiate school-community programs.

   b. Supporting various efforts to encourage and strengthen parent organization activities - parent and parent teacher workshops.

   c. Assisting associate superintendents or assistant superintendents or principals in tension situations.

   d. Providing speakers from its staff on appropriate subjects for parent associations or community groups.

   e. Maintaining close liasion with many city-wide organizations in the fields of intergroup relations or civil rights.

2. Staff:

   a. Clarifying the position of school community coordinators including budget positions, and responsibilities and relationships to assistant superintendents, Human Relations Unit and Public Information Unit clarified.

   b. Developing a training program for the coordinators through monthly conference, committee work, and through conferences and workshops outside the school system.

   c. Conducting human relations district courses for school staffs reviewed and improved - a continuing process.

   d. Experiments with a pilot program in in-service seminar for staffs of selected schools.

   e. Speaking at faculty conferences and principals' conference on human relations topics.

f. Speaking at meetings of professional associations.

g. Helping to resolve instances of charges of racial discrimination on the part of the staff.

3. Pupils:

a. Working with faculty and students in student government, human relations clubs, civic clubs, forums, panels, etc. to improve programs.

b. Studying in cooperation with Research Division the view of student teachers of City University in regard to schools and teaching in them.

c. Instituting in cooperation with NYC Housing Authority and the Municipal College a tutorial program - college involving high school students and junior high school students.

d. Developing a library of books, periodicals, pamphlets and materials from other cities and states.

e. Working with BAVI (Bureau Audio Visual Instruction) to procure films and tapes on human relations subjects for parent, teachers, pupils.

4. Other Activities:

a. Working with other agencies within the school system in various programs.

(1) Elementary and Junior High School Divisions and the Central Zoning Unit on Open Enrollment.

(2) Curriculum and elementary Divisions on programs for NE (Non-english) speaking children.

(3) Research Division of Open Enrollment, ADNS.

(4) Teacher Recruitment Bureau on staffing problems.

b. Serving as advisor to other agencies of the school system on particular problems involving inter-group or minority group matters.

c. Representing the school system at conferences or conventions or on committee on human relations subjects outside the school system.

B. PRESENT PLANS

Budget proposals for 1963-1964 represent the need to meet the growth of the above mentioned activities as they are spread throughout the system and to develop other activities in connection with school-community and parent participation, high school youth, and curriculum offerings.[7]

---

[7] Frank Turner, et al; op. cit. pp. 8-10.

Open Enrollment:

The Open Enrollment program was a major step toward implementation of the Board of Education's recognition of its responsibilities to provide a better ethnic balance in the schools. The brief description that follows does not fully describe the problems and progress of the total program. However, these aspects will be treated more fully in the final chapters.

This program, as it operates on the elementary school level, allows students in the second, third and fourth grades of schools with 90% or above Negro and Puerto Rican population, called "sending" schools, to submit applications for transfer to "receiving" schools with a more equitably balanced ethnic population consisting of 75% and above "others".

A Pilot Program for grades one and two of 12 selected "sending" schools permits any child in these classes to submit applications for transfer to "receiving" schools, where the ratio of "others" is 75% or above.

The number of students transferred to each school and to the grades of the school is controlled by the size of the registers in the "receiving" school, and the school's capacity. (i.e.) utilization index of less than 90%.

The number of students assigned to a grade is never above two-thirds of the present register of the grade. The entering students are held by this means to 40 or 45% of the new register ("new register" being the sum of those attending the school from the neighborhood and the incoming students).

Students in the sixth year of any elementary schools which normally feed junior high schools with 85% or above Negro and Puerto Rican population, may apply for assignment to junior high schools with a more evenly balanced ethnic composition.

Summary

The four programs described above and the other listed programs are commendable and promising moves toward the solution of New York City's educational needs. However, the fact remains that the educational problems and needs of a vast proportion of the school population are not being and cannot be, adequately met within the basic structure and program of the present New York City school system.

Additional resources are needed to provide quality education, but changes in the basic attitudes of certain teachers and administrators related to the educability of Negro and Puerto Rican students will definitely enhance the newer educational methods and programs of New York City.

V. The Present Status of the "X" and "Y" Schools

The present evaluation of the status of the "X" and "Y" schools differs from that of the Public Education Association study in four basic ways. The first stems from the building, program and zoning, and school population changes that have taken place since the original report. The second has to do with emphases, i.e., the P.E.A.'s reliance upon the principals' appraisal and judgment of the adequacy of facilities, equipment and services; the P.E.A.'s use of school lunch figures as an index of economic levels and the correlation of these levels with test and achievement data; the Urban League's concern with the definition and application of the basic tenets of democratic public education and equal opportunities; the Urban League's approach in terms of recommendations.

The third relates to the origin of the studies. The P.E.A. study was requested by the president of the Board of Education, while the Urban League requested permission of the school system to undertake such a study. The fourth is that the P.E.A. study was basically set up to study the factors involved in the status of these schools and to make a factual report. The Urban League study also reports factual data - related to the status of the "X" and "Y" schools but it is even more concerned with assessing changes in the status of these schools and the relative lack of overall improvement since 1955.

In 1955 the P.E.A. studied all "X" schools; 42 elementay and 11 junior highs and a selected group of 60 "Y" schools. The present Urban League study encompasses 118 elementary and 29 junior high "X" schools and an equal number of selected "Y" schools. All of the original P.E.A. "X" and "Y" schools that are still in operation and maintain the same status are included in the present study. There are 26 elementary and five junior high P.E.A. "X" schools and 32 elementary and 11 junior high P.E.A. "Y" schools included.

A. CLASS SIZE

The P.E.A. study classified the elementary schools as "difficult" and "ordinary" but found that only 3% of the "Y" schools fell into this category while 90% of the "X" schools were considered "difficult." This ratio would hold true at this time using "special service" schools as the criteria. The two tables below show the P.E.A. findings in this area.

TABLE I 1955(1)

Average Class Size in Difficult and Ordinary Elementary Schools, Excluding Special Classes

	Group Y	Group X
Difficult Schools	29.5	34.2
Ordinary Schools	31.1	35.1

The children in both types of "X" schools were in larger classes. However, when the special classes were studied they revealed the following data:

TABLE 2 1955(2)

Average Number and Size of Special Classes

	Elementary		Junior High	
	Group Y	Group X	Group Y	Group X
Average Number of Special Classes Per School	2.1 #(56)	6.2 (41)	7.8 (15)	15.0 (9)
Average Special Class Size	22.1 #(34)	18.8 (38)	24.8 (15)	23.5 (9)

---

(1) Public Education Association Study - 1955.
(2) Ibid.

The date from the present study indicates that the "X" elementary and junior high schools, which are largely special service schools, have slightly smaller classes than the "Y" schools which are ordinary except for two special service schools.

TABLE 3 1963

Average Group Y Class Size

	Elementary School	Junior High School
City Average	30.4	32.2
Standard Size	31.5	32.5
Group Y Average	32.8	31.4

TABLE 4 1963

Average Group X Class Size

	Elementary School	Junior High School
City Average	28.7	29.0
Standard Size	28.0	28.0
Group Y Average	28.9	30.5

B. SPECIAL SERVICES

The services available within the schools in New York City have increased tremendously since 1955. The addition of professional personnel and services in the "X" schools has been particularly noteworthy. There are 201 special service schools in New York City. These schools have additional counselors, supplies, programs, psychologists, social workers and teachers. Special music, art and science programs are often added as are reading clinics, career guidance classes, and teacher specialists. A comparison of a regular "Y" elementary school and a special service "X" elementary school that is also a Higher Horizons school is described in the table below.

TABLE 5

	Y School		X School
Register:	900	---Approximately---	900
Classroom teachers	25		32
Higher Horizons Program teachers			3
Reading Improvement teacher	1		1
Corrective reading teacher			1
Health Education teacher	1		
Library teacher	1		1
Guidance Counselor	1		1
Early identification and prevention program positions			2
All day neighborhood school program teacher			7
Assistant to Principal	1		2
Principal	1		1
Total Staff	31		51

This gives the "Y" school an approximate ratio of 40 professionals per thousand students and the "X" school an approximate ratio of 60 professionals per thousand students.

Additional information relating to special services is to be found in Chapter IV, and the appendices.

C. ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS

The results of education are not limited to school achievement but many factors from the outside world leave traces in the personality of an individual that are difficult to assess. Still, the final test of the quality of education is its result. The basic fact that the Public Education Association study uncovered regarding achievement was that the longer the Negro and Puerto Rican student remained in school, the lower their achievement level fell. The reason for this phenomenon will be explored in depth in the body of this study. However, current achievement data reveals the trend noted below:

AVERAGE ARITHMETIC TEST SCORES

	Group "X" Norms		Group "X" Norms	
	1955	1962	1955	1962
6th grade	4.7	5.4	6.9	7.8
8th grade	6.0	6.1	8.4	9.2

Third grade achievement figures are not available. In 1955 the "X" group in the sixth grade was 2.2 grades behind the "Y" group and in the eighth grade 2.4 grades behind. The 1962 data show the sixth grade "X" group 2.4 grades lower than the "Y" group and the eighth grade "X" group 3.1 grades (over three full years) behind the "Y" group.

AVERAGE READING TEST SCORES

	Group "X" Norms		Group "Y" Norms	
	1955	1962	1955	1962
3rd grade	2.5	2.9	3.7	4.4
6th grade	4.7	4.8	6.9	7.9
8th grade	6.0	6.1	8.4	9.6

The above chart compares changes in reading achievement based upon average reading test scores in selected grades of X and Y schools.

In the seven years from 1955 to 1962, the gap between X and Y schools has grown wider in reading achievement when measured by average reading test scores.

In 1955, Y schools scored higher on the reading tests than the X schools. In the third grade, Y schools read at a level 1.2 years higher than the X schools; in the sixth grade, 2.2 years higher and in the eighth grade, 2.4 higher than the corresponding grades in X schools.

In 1962, Y schools still attained higher reading scores than X schools and showed a higher percentage of improvement than X schools. In the third grade, Y schools read at a level 1.5 years higher than the X schools; in the sixth grade, 3.1 years higher, and in the eighth grade, 3.5 years higher than the corresponding grades in the X schools.

VI. Physical Facilities

In New York City, the Board of Education is firmly committed to the policy of equality for all children including facilities and resources.

Too often the Board of Education seems to be primarily concerned with the physical structure of the building: Is it sound? Is there adequate maintenance? Will the building last for another ten years? So in essence, all public school buildings and facilities must be evaluated from two points of view: first, in terms of a sound educational environment and second, as a safe, comfortable and healthy environment for children and teachers.

The building program of the Board of Education has provided 40 new schools during the past five years. This has made possible the significant distribution of ethnic groups in new housing. Twenty-six of these buildings are replacements for schools in segregated neighborhoods. Six of the new junior high schools became segregated schools almost immediately because of their location in high Negro - Puerto Rican populated areas. Location of these schools in segregated areas appears to conflict with the expressed intent of the Board of Education to effect school integration. The Board has maintained that junior high school pupils may travel for educational purposes. However, they have continued to build junior high schools on a "neighborhood school" basis.

Specific changes must be made not only in the quality of education but in the improvement and equalization of physical facilities as they affect the "X" and "Y" schools. The "X" schools comprise the greatest number of old buildings in need of major repairs; the greatest number of over-utilized schools; the greatest number of buildings in need of modernization or installation of libraries, student cafeterias, sanitary and other necessary facilities. The "X" schools should, therefore, be assigned a high priority for action in these instances.

Ask children about schools and they understand two things, the main things: what they usually like about good schools is (1) the learning of new things, and (2) the teacher. They are, of course, basically right. Learning and teaching constitutes the heart of any school. The building and its equipment are the pulse. The pulse should be the index of equal opportunity and quality in education. Some teachers point out that the building itself is of importance. These want a classroom that is easy to housekeep, a teacher's room where a cup of coffee can be enjoyed in peace and quiet, or parking space for their cars near school. Other teachers, however, are concerned with an environment in which children have adequate facilities and improved learning materials. The environment for learning and living in the classroom affects the child to a greater degree than is suspected by teachers and others simply because children take it for granted as a part of their normal lot in life. Some of the ways it affects children are obvious. If the classroom atmosphere (physical or social) is bad, it can impede the teaching and learning progress. More specifically, if the student can't hear the teacher due to outside noises, if the room is too warm or cold, if the lighting is inadequate and the chairs uncomfortable, if the class is too big or the room over-crowded, quality education is hindered. Finally, the child is aware of the "institutional feeling" of sameness. In the opinion of many educators, these feelings build up as a child sits day after day, year after year in a chair just like other chairs at a desk just like other desks. Children are aware that their room with dingy walls is just like the other classrooms in the schools - same size and over-crowded. The health, safety and comfort of pupils housed in such buildings need the sincere attention of the Board of Education. Current research reveals that children do not learn best when sitting silent unmoving at a desk with a book before them. They learn best when they work in a classroom designed as a laboratory for purposeful group planning, group activities, individual study and reading, class discussion and interaction. These classrooms are provided with maps, globes, radio, recording equipment, a library corner, work bench, running water, easels, storage area, movable desks and tables. Such learning facilities, although housing fewer pupils, require larger floor space than the learning programs of former years.

The consensus of many experts regarding physical facilities emerges in the considerations below:

1. The school building should be used for diverse

learning in order to assist in guiding students toward the attainment of a wide variety of objectives.

2. The "schoolhouse" itself can help teach children an appreciation of beauty, prudence in the utilization of space, and the spirit of harmonious living.
3. Classrooms and all other instructional areas should be designed and equipped to provide the conditions under which children learn best.
4. Modern facilities in education require gymnasiums, auditoriums, cafeterias for students and teachers, indoor and outside play space in the elementary and junior high school together with related facilities as dressing rooms, lockers, and showers.
5. The music program is an important part of a good school. Once limited to classroom choral work, emphasis is now on bands, orchestras, a variety of choral groups and individual instrumental work.

The percentage of utilization is a convenient index in determining the full use of the "schoolhouse" for the many learning activities already mentioned. Utilization of a school represents the percentage ratio of the actual enrollment to the actual capacity of the building. It is recognized that over the years and continuing into the present, New York City elementary and junior high schools are largely neighborhood schools. Consequently, the ethnic composition of neighborhoods is generally reflected in these two categories of public schools.

The high rate of in-migratory pupil mobility is especially acute in the Negro and Puerto Rican residential areas. It is in these neighborhoods that more schools are over-utilized. A survey of utilization figures taken from 1962 data, (October 31st), shows the following results:

Utilization	Elementary		Junior High	
Percentage	X Schools	Y Schools	X Schools	Y Schools
Under 50%	2	2	-	-
50 - 74	5	23	1	2
75 - 99	33	44	16	16
100 - 124	54	38	19	10
Over 125%	17	6	1	1

There are 71 "X" elementary schools over-utilized, or over the 100% level while there are 42 "Y" schools in the same category. Similarly in the junior high schools almost twice as many "X" as "Y" schools are over-utilized.

Over-utilization means classroom shortages, overlapping class schedules, classes held in the auditorium, gymnasium and other inappropriate places. Over-utilization also means over-crowding of halls and other school facilities. There is, in short, a definite inequality in the utilization of the schools attended by Negro and Puerto Rican children. An additional problem for the schools is pupil mobility. Obviously this turnover makes difficult the proper organization and, administration of schools as well as the proper utilization of physical facilities.

Racial residential segregation in New York City is necessarily related to the neighborhood school and its segregated patterns, especially at the elementary level. When Negro and Puerto Rican parents live in an over-crowded, often dilapidated, area their children will attend schools which have the same physical characteristics and high density population. These neighborhoods are located in the older sections of the city where many of the schools are ancient. Admittedly replacement and modernization is expensive. However, obsolete buildings often require large annual maintenance expenditures and are unfit for the learning process. As the Commission on Integration reported: "...if such (maintenance) expenditures were made, some physical facilities would still remain strikingly inadequate." From January 1, 1957, to December 31, 1962, 81 new elementary and junior high school buildings were opened to accommodate newly developed areas, to relieve present and future over-crowding, and to replace many unsafe inadequate structures.

The ethnic composition of the new elementary and junior high schools have the following distribution:

Year	"X"	"Y"	Mid-Range Distribution	Total
1957	2	7	4	13
1958	5	7	12	24
1959	7	1	7	15
1960	6	0	4	10
1961	1	1	6	8
1962	5	1	6	12
Totals	26	16	39	81

It appears that the Board of Education adhered to the 1956 Commission on Integration's recommendations which were:

1. In the location of new schools, sites be selected which will, to the maximum degree, facilitate enrollment by different ethnic groups. There is the greatest opportunity for this at the junior high school level.
2. The board of Education should give the highest priority to adequate modernization and new construction of school buildings in areas of mixed ethnic population.

New York has a considerable backlog of replacement and modernization needs in the schools. To meet these needs requires consideration of a changing population, enrollment trends, existing under-utilized schools in overpopulated areas and other socio-economic factors that determine where a new school is to be built and when an existing one is to be rehabilitated.

Often the lack of money is not the retarding factor in school construction. It is rather a lack of coordination among the numerous city agencies involved, time consuming procedures in selecting, acquiring and clearing sites, and ineffective planning in the building program.

The Board of Education is faced with the dual responsibility of constructing new buildings in the rapidly growing areas of Richmond and Queens as well as the modernization or replacement of the older structures in Harlem and other depressed communities. Study of the present new building program indicates that unless and until there is extensive upgrading of "X" school facilities, there can be no real progress toward equality in school facilities.

Since 1955, an increasing number of schools have been built in segregated neighborhoods. These 26 "newly" segregated schools obviously have not facilitated the enrollment of different ethnic groups. The concern here is that the painful problem of desegregation has been created by these new "X" schools instead of being eliminated. Desegregation of the older "X" schools has proven to be an extremely difficult task even with present programs of Open Enrollment, rezoning practices, and zoning variances. It is significant to note that of the 26 schools, six are junior high schools. The Commission stated that there was a greater possibility of integration at this level; yet, Junior High School 33, Brooklyn, Junior High School 13, Manhattan, Junior High School 117, Manhattan,Junior High School 46, Brooklyn, Junior High School 136, Bronx, and Junior High School 45, Manhattan were constructed. The Sub-Commission Report on Physical Plant and Maintenance held: "Children of junior high school age can easily travel a reasonable distance and, therefore, a location desirable from the point of view of integration is often a practical choice." Unfortunately, however, these recommendations have not been followed and the Board of Education has built, and is continuing to build, schools which are "newly" segregated and resegregated.

More than one third of the public schools now in use were constructed before 1920. In the same period over two-thirds of the elementary schools were constructed. From the years 1955 through 1961 over sixty percent of the "X" elementary schools were constructed and 28 per cent of the "Y" schools. It is evident that since 1955 the Board of Education has been building a great many "X" and "Y" schools with all of the "X" schools being built in the same neighborhoods thus continuing the previous segregated pattern. Most of the existing "Y" schools were constructed after 1920, while the majority of the "X" schools were built prior to 1920.

The 1956 report of the Sub-Commission on Physical Plant and Maintenance stated: "That the Board of Education discharge appropriations for upkeep and maintenance...in the modernization of existing buildings, provisions for special classrooms, kindergartens, lunchrooms, play areas, sanitary facilities and the like developed in light of the needs of the population to be served. Priority should be given to lunchroom facilities... adequate facilities for teachers in modernized buildings are of utmost importance and should be provided as an instrument for attracting and holding teachers." The schools being modernized, converted or enlarged are presently two "X" schools, 12 "Y" schools, and 13 schools at the mid-range level. If this is significant at the present time, it is meaningful to look at the development since 1957.

Table of Modernizations, Additions or Both; Conversions 1957-1963:

1957			1958			1959		
School	% Other	Type	School	% Other	Type	School	% Other	Type
P 64M	34.0	M	J 52M	88.5	Y	P 179M	5.6	X
J 88M	1.2	X	P 192M	27.0	M			
P 93K	0.7	X	J 136K	71.7	M	J 38X	18.0	M
P 251K	97.5	Y	P 24Q	91.9	Y	J 50K	44.2	M
P 284K	11.6	M	P 201Q	95.7	Y	P 148K	5.4	X

1960			1961			1962-1963		
School	% Other	Type	School	% Other	Type	School	% Other	Type
J 99M	6.8	X	P 101M	2.3	X	P 116M	70.8	M
P 23X	0.7	X	P 24X	100.0	Y	J 38X	19.6	M
P 51X	2.9	X	J 52X	9.1	X	P 41X	80.1	M
J 142K	46.1	M	P 37X	9.9	X	J 60X	11.0	X
P 213K	95.8	Y	P 29K	35.6	M	P 52K	97.5	Y
J 141Q	91.5	Y	P 242K	71.2	M	P 242K	72.2	M
P 171M	1.8	X	J 93Q	95.2	Y	P 272K	96.0	Y
P 139Q	99.3	Y				P 13Q	97.8	Y
						J 40Q	0.9	X
						P 143Q	10.9	M
						P 196Q	99.9	Y
						P 215Q	98.8	Y
						P 163Q	97.7	Y
						P 196K	20.9	M
						P 19K	21.2	M
						P 193Q	100.0	Y
						P 236K	99.6	Y

P = Elementary School; J = Junior High School; M = Manhattan; K = Brooklyn; X = Bronx; Q = Queens

"X" Elementary and Junior High Schools with 90% or more Negro and/or Puerto Rican enrollment.

"Y" Elementary and Junior High Schools with 90% ore more others (other than Negro and Puerto Rican)

Since 1957, 13 "X" schools underwent major renovation while 17 "Y" schools were modernized, added to or converted. The fact is, however, that the "X" schools are more outdated than the "Y" schools. Considering the recommendations of the Commission, the Board of Education, in order to establish equal facilities particularly in regard to the existing "X" and "Y" buildings, should be cognizant of the need for more modernization of the "X" schools.

The general condition of buildings is given next consideration. The 1959 Board of Education's Inventory of School Buildings revealed the following statistics of defective physical facilities:

	Per Cent of Total	
	X	Y
Roof	15%	11%
Windows	30%	11%
Plastering	10%	10%
Painting	30%	25%
Heating System	20%	7%
Electric System	19%	5%
Plumbing System	10%	11%
General Structure	17%	3%

The need of major repairs are greater in the "X" schools than "Y" especially in the areas of general structure, electrical equipment and the conditions of windows.

The following comments from the school principals and custodians were recorded at the time of inventory in some of the "X" schools: "The heating system is of low pressure steam, and is antiquated, requiring frequent repair, and conversion to an oil burner is necessary." "...that because of the gravity system of heating the school there was insufficient radiation in the rooms and no radiation in the stairwells. Also, the indoor play areas required extra or larger heating units. This school was built in 1898."

Comments concerning the pupils' cafeteria included the following: "This eating space is fantastically small for so large a school. The kitchen needs a stove for cooking and a real refrigerator and not just a milk cooler." "...need for a stove to provide adequate facilities for proper food preparation." "The floor is in very bad condition;...no facilities to wash garbage cans or to store them."

A principal reported that his teachers' cafeteria was just a room equipped with tables and chairs, a two burner stove, and two small dish cabinets. Another principal noted, "Our teachers' cafeteria is too small for a teachers' lunchroom and the facilities consist of one old gas range and a sink in poor condition. This school was built in 1912."

"The electrical system is inadequate because of DC current and is unsuitable for most audio-visual equipment. In addition all the bells must be rung manually. This school was built in 1903. And this building is still on the 'new building punch list.' Already many sections of the plaster need repair and a paint job still has to be done (some two years later)."

"Our school has reported serious structural defects, such as improperly hinged doors, defective window sashes, broken staircases and tile, and such. In addition, we have been awaiting these repairs for two years."

Below is a summary of the facilities which were surveyed in the 1962 National Inventory of New York City Public Schools:

Index of Facilities in a Modern School	Number of Facilities Lacking in the "X" Schools
Auditorium	19
Gymnasium	22
Showers and Dressing Rooms	10
Cafeteria	28
Modern Kitchens	79
Centralized Library	16

Building Program	X	Y	Mid-Range
Proposed New Schools 1963-64 Capital Budget	14	16	20
Schools Awaiting Construction	16	14	18
Schools Presently Under Construction	10	10	6

From the above table it is clear that the rate of building new "X" and "Y" schools is about the same. The fact is, however, that the "X" schools are the ones that are in need of immediate rehabilitation or replacement. However, it should be emphasized again that, in building new schools, the number in the mid-range group should be greatly increased; otherwise there will be more "newly" segregated schools. For the modernization or replacement of schools, the table below shows the general status of present "X" and "Y" buildings:

Status of Schools	No. X Schools 1956	No. X Schools 1962	No. Y Schools 1956	No. Y Schools 1962
No Major Structural Change	24	77	57	85
Modernizations, Additions or Conversions 0-5 Years	7	18	7	35
Replacement 0-5 Years	11	34	1	16

Construction Dates of School Buildings

(Elementary Schools X and Y)

Construction Date	1955[1]		1962	
	"X"	"Y"	"X"	"Y"
Before 1900	32%	5%	13%	9%
1900 - 1910	29%	23%	34%	17%
1920 - 1930	22%	48%	13%	46%
1940 - later	17%	24%	35%	28%

Junior High Schools (X and Y)

	1955		1962	
	"X"	"Y"	"X"	"Y"
Before 1900	0%	0%	4%	0%
1900-1910	56%	0%	14%	1%
1920-1939	33%	60%	32%	39%
1940 or later	11%	40%	50%	60%

---

[1] PEA Study

Construction of New York City Public Schools, Spring 1962

	Total City-wide		Elementary	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Total Number of Permanent Buildings and Additions	1,132	100.0	789	69.7
Before 1920	378	33.4	284	25.1
1920-1929	228	20.1	164	14.5
1930-1939	178	15.7	114	10.1
1940-1949	49	4.3	31	2.7
1950-1959	224	19.8	148	13.1
After 1959	46	4.1	32	2.8
Under Construction	29	2.6	16	1.4

The physical facilities of the public schools of New York City have been replaced, renovated and modernized to a great extent, but much remains to be accomplished. This can only be done when proper funds are acquired to provide the type of massive rebuilding program proposed recently by Superintendent Calvin Gross and Executive Deputy Superintendent Bernard Donovan.

Inadequacies within or/of the physical plant retard excellence of education for all children and youth.

This section has dealt with some of the major problems and inequalities within the construction and maintenance area of education as well as certain high points of progress. Additional data is to be found in the appendices, and the final recommendations are listed in the concluding chapter.

APPENDICES

I

Special Census of School Population - Composition of Register
Number and Per Cent by Borough and School Group
October 31, 1962

Borough	Number of Pupils				Per Cent of Total Register			
	Puerto Rican	Negro	Others	Total	Puerto Rican	Negro	Others	Total
Manhattan								
Elementary	35,053	41,579	23,617	100,249	35.0	41.5	23.5	100.0
Junior High	11,692	13,527	10,012	35,231	33.2	38.4	28.4	100.0
Bronx								
Elementary	34,119	26,208	50,662	110,989	30.7	23.6	45.7	100.0
Junior High	11,195	9,093	19,750	40,038	28.0	22.7	49.3	100.0
Brooklyn								
Elementary	39,062	64,278	116,254	219,594	17.8	29.3	52.9	100.0
Junior High	11,105	19,262	40,668	71,135	15.8	27.1	57.1	100.0
Queens								
Elementary	2,653	24,920	102,659	130,232	2.0	19.1	78.9	100.0
Junior High	913	7,486	35,114	43,513	2.1	17.2	80.7	100.0
Richmond								
Elementary	408	1,785	18,498	20,691	2.0	8.6	89.4	100.0
Junior High	66	299	3,011	3,376	2.0	8.9	89.1	100.0

II

GROUP Y SCHOOLS

*P.E.A. SCHOOLS

BROOKLYN

JHS	DISTRICT	JHS	DISTRICT	JHS	DISTRICT	JHS	DISTRICT
14	40	223*	37	240*	40	220*	36
96*	38	227*	37	259*	36	234*	40
162	33	228*	39	278	40	285	41

BRONX

JHS	DISTRICT	JHS	DISTRICT	JHS	DISTRICT	JHS	DISTRICT
127	23	135	23	141	22	143	22

QUEENS

JHS	DISTRICT	JHS	DISTRICT	JHS	DISTRICT	JHS	DISTRICT
10*	46	109	51	168	48	216*	52
67	52	119	49	185	45	218	48
74	52	145*	45	194	45		
73	47	157	47				

GROUP X SCHOOLS

#HIGHER HORIZONS SCHOOLS

BROOKLYN

JHS	DISTRICT	JHS	DISTRICT	JHS	DISTRICT	JHS	DISTRICT
33	31	73	34	210#	32	263	42
35#	32	117	27	258#	27	265	25
57	32	[illegible]	34				

BRONX

52	16	60	17	136	17	149	15
55*	19	120#	17	139	15		

QUEENS

JHS	DISTRICT	JHS	DISTRICT
40#	50	142#	50

MANHATTAN

JHS	DISTRICT	JHS	DISTRICT	JHS	DISTRICT	JHS	DISTRICT
13#	10	88	11	120*#	10	139*#	12
43#	11	99	9	136*#	13	164*	13
45	10	117	10				

III

GROUP X SCHOOLS

BROOKLYN

*P.E.A. SCHOOLS   #HIGHER HORIZONS SCHOOLS

PS	DISTRICT	PS	DISTRICT	PS	DISTRICT	PS	DISTRICT
3#	27	44*#	27	137	34	256#	27
7	25	46	25	138	27	257	31
11	25	47*	26	144	32	262#	32
21#	32	54	27	147	31	270	27
24	33	59	31	148	31	284	42
25	32	67	25	150	42	287	25
26	32	87	34	168	31	289#	27
27	26	93#	27	175	42	297	31
28	32	125	42	184	42	298	42
42	27	129*#	32	243#	27	304	32
						305	27

BRONX

PS	DISTRICT	PS	DISTRICT	PS	DISTRICT	PS	DISTRICT
2	19	23*#	17	39	17	62	16
4	20	25	16	42	20	63*	19
9	15	27	15	43	15	66	17
18	15	30	15	51#	16	99*	17
20	17	37	15	54	17	124*#	16
132	19	140#	17	146#	17	130	16
				150	17	154	15

MANHATTAN

PS	DISTRICT	PS	DISTRICT	PS	DISTRICT	PS	DISTRICT
4	3	90#	13	119#	12	170*#	11
7	10	100#	12	121	9	171*#	9
24*#	12	101	10	123	13	175#	12
31	2	102*	10	129	12	179	8
39	12	103*#	10	133	12	180	11
57*#	10	107*	9	144	11	184	11
68*#	12	108*#	10	156	13	186	13
72*#	9*#	109*	9	157	11	191	8
80	10	113	11	161	10	194	13
81	11	197*#	12				

QUEENS

PS	DISTRICT	PS	DISTRICT	PS	DISTRICT	PS	DISTRICT
15	50	92#	48	123	50	140*#	50
36	50	110	50	127	45	160*#	50
45#	50	116*#	50	136	50		
48*#	50	118	50				

GROUP Y SCHOOLS

BROOKLYN

*P.E.A. SCHOOLS

PS	DISTRICT	PS	DISTRICT	PS	DISTRICT	PS	DISTRICT
34*	30	104	36	177*	38	207	40
48	37	105*	36	185	36	208	41
52	40	112*	37	186*	38	222	40
89	35	114	41	192*	38	226	38
94	28	119	40	194	40	236	40
95	39	127*	36	199	40	238	40
97	39	152	35	200	38	248*	39
99	40	153	40	203	40	269	35
100	40	160*	36	204*	37	272	41
101	39	164*	37	206	40	277	40

BRONX

PS	DISTRICT	PS	DISTRICT	PS	DISTRICT	PS	DISTRICT
14	18	87	24	91*	21	97	23
17	24	64	20	94	22	105*	23
24*	22	81	22	95	22	108	23
46	22	86	22	96	23	109	20

MANHATTAN

6	7	23	1	40	5

QUEENS

2	45	49	47	108	49	163	48
5	46	55*	50	113	49	164	48
6	46	58	49	114*	49	165	48
12	47	62	49	115	51	173	48
18	51	64	49	117	51	175*	47
22	48	66*	49	128	47	177*	52
27	45	70*	46	135	51	179	52
29	45	78*	47	137	50	184	45
32	48	82	51	138	50	186	51
33	51	84*	46	139*	47	187	52
38	50	97	49	146	49	188*	52
41	52	99*	51	153*	47	193	45
46	52	100	49	159	52	196*	49
199	46*	206	47	214	48	220	47
200	48	213	52	215*	49		

V

APPENDIX

The Commission on Integration was appointed by the Board of Education in the fall of 1955. It was composed of 37 civic and educational leaders, including members of the Board and five members of its professional staff. It was instructed to study and recommend solutions for the problems of "de facto" school segregation and inequality of educational opportunity resulting from the residential segregation of Negro and Puerto Rican and other minority groups.

Conclusions of the Six Subcommissions

1. Segregated education is inferior education. The concentration of racial minorities in the classroom and in the schoolyard inflicts psychological wounds on the segregated groups, and the majority group suffers socially and psychologically through its isolation from the majority.
2. Whether school segregation is the effect of law and custom as in the South or has its roots in residential segregation, its defects are inherent and incurable. In education there can be no such thing as "separate but equal". Educationally, as well as morally and socially, the only remedy for the segregated school is its desegregation.

VI

Recommendations of the Six Subcommissions

1. Zoning

In addition to the traditional objectives of zoning, establish as a cardinal principle the objective of integration.

Formulation by the superintendent of schools of a comprehensive zoning plan to be administered by a new professional bureau, - the Central Zoning Unit.

The superintendent of schools should provide the Central Zoning Unit with a time table for the accomplishment of integration, and describe the procedures to be employed in redrawing boundary lines, the location of special classes and courses, and the selective use of bus transportation and also permissive enrollment desiged for the promotion of integration.

Establishment of an Advisory Council on Zoning composed of representatives of city departments and agencies such as the City Planning Commission, the New York City Housing Authority, the Traffic Department, the Commission on Intergroup Relations, etc. This Council should provide for the interdepartmental exchange of information and the participation of interested civic groups, with a view toward the development of comprehensive long-term plans for the achievement of more racially-balanced schools and communities.

To promote, through a broad community relations program, intergroup understanding and acceptance of the zoning plans in all school districts for more effective zoning action.

2. Educational Standards and Curriculum

Raise academic achievement to maximum potential. Level out undue variations from school to school and from community to community in the curriculum and syllabus requirements.

Increase number of regularly appointed teachers.

To raise the level of academic achievement, the Subcommission recommended the development by the superintendent of schools and his staff of an intensive educational program. Procedures in placement of children in the adjustment and opportunity classes in the IGC (intellectually gifted) and SP (special progress) classes should be re-examined. CRMD (mentally retarded) classes should be re-examined within a year. Range of special classes should be equally available to all schools.

Classification and promotion of children should be in terms of their achievement level but supplemented by intensive remedial programs. Syllabus and curriculum requirements should be set for each grade. The board should establish definite limits within which certain modifications may be permitted and certain requirements should be made mandatory.

More equitable proportions of regular and experienced teachers should be appointed. Better communication between parents and teachers should be established. OTP'S (other teaching positions) should be added.

3. Guidance, Educational Stimulation and Placement

Formulate new minimum guidance program for SS (special service) schools.

Encourage students of all faiths and ethnic origins to prepare themselves as teachers and counselors.

Recruit non-white and Spanish speaking personnel in guidance.

Strengthen parent organizations.

Create more extensive and intensive program of mental testing, observation and other techniques in third, sixth and tenth grades, including individual tests for scholastic aptitudes. Also test for specific aptitudes - music, art, etc.

IX.

Reduce class size; provide psychological, psychiatric and social services.

Provide parking area for the cars of school personnel.

Require applicants for promotion to supervisory positions to serve a three-year period in special service schools.

Base teacher assignments on the needs of schools rather than the preference of teachers and principals.

Establish a ratio of regular ten substitute teachers for each division and assign an adequate number of permanent teachers to each school.

Promote a policy of staff integration.

Formulate a Board policy statement pointing out that a positive attitude toward all groups, regardless of race, religion or national origin, is a prerequisite for appointment or promotion.

Alert teacher training institutions to the need that candidates for their courses should possess informed attitudes in the field of race relations.

Establish in-service courses in human relations and intercultural understanding.

Form a specific, permanent recruitment unit within the Division of Personnel.

Continue strides aimed at measuring the incidence of successful college candidates coming from high schools of different ethnic groups, potential college candidates, and those who drop out.

Build programs of stimulation for lifting the aspirations of each child to his highest potential.

4. Physical Plant and Maintenance

Select new school sites which will facilitate the enrollment of mixed ethnic groups.

Assign high priority to adequate modernization and new school construction in areas of mixed ethnic populations.

Modernize existing buildings. Provisions should be made for special classrooms, kindergartens, lunchrooms, play areas, sanitary facilities, adequate facilities for teachers.

Consider population trends in selection of sites.

Provide adequate appropriations for maintenance and new plant construction.

5. Teacher Assignment and Personnel

Provide special schools with additional positions (supervisory, non-teaching and otherwise) so as to permit teachers to devote more time to teaching.

6. Community Relations and Information

Create an expanded, centralized community relations unit to guide and help assistant superintendents and principals in the development, expansion and organization of community councils.

Establish a continuing liaison by the field staff of the community liaison with the Board of Education's divisions and bureaus, the State Commission Against Discrimination, Commission on Intergroup Relations, New York City Housing Authority and the City Planning Commission.

Request the Commission on Intergroup Relations to initiate two pilot projects in neighborhoods to be selected in consultation with the superintendent of schools. A public information unit should be organized within the Board to disseminate, through radio, press and television, information on policy and administration of the school system.

Utilize newly integrated school areas to provide opportunities for neighborhood councils.

XII.

APPENDIX

EXCERPTS FROM A JOINT STATEMENT BY MR. CHARLES H. SILVER, PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION, AND DR. THEOBALD, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS (2 P.M. WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 31, 1960).

.....Assimilation of minority groups has always been a major problem of the United States and particularly of its large cities. Clearly, people cannot be assimilated in isolation. Such isolation not only deprives them of the full benefits of our democracy but in turn deprives our democracy of the full benefits these people can contribute. We have found over the past several years that the Negro and Puerto Rican population of our city can achieve through education and contribute to our progress far more than has been possible under the present pattern of our social structure. It is logical, therefore, that we provide greater opportunity for them to join educationally with the rest of our population.

Such an opportunity, popularly referred to as racial integration in our schools, is an essential and imperative element of democratic education in our city and nation especially at this juncture in world history. The ever-increasing demand for trained human intelligence imposes an even greater responsibility upon a school system to determine and develop effectively all the potential entrusted to it for this purpose. Moreover, the challenge of a foreign ideology demands the utmost diligence in the development, preservation and improvement in our democratic processes.

XIII.

Our school system in New York City is a complex and big one, and the quality of our schools varies. A school can be a good school regardless of ethnic distribution, but there can be little doubt, in terms of what we hold dear in our nation, that a school has certain additional values for our democracy if its student body represents a variety of ethnic and religious distributions.

This was, substantially, what was expressed by the Board of Education in December 1954, when the Board created its Commission on Integration to study ways in which greater educational opportunities could be provided for pupils residing in areas with a high concentration of minority groups. However, both the Commission and Board recognized that the residential patterns in the City are a deterrent to securing heterogeneous school populations, and consequently determined to proceed with sound educational measures on two fronts (1) to continue the improvement of services in schools with minority group concentrations and (2) to secure better ethnic distribution in our schools.

As a consequence, many steps have been taken, after careful study to provide the best possible opportunities for children attending schools in relatively segregated residential areas. A report detailing these steps, entitled Toward Greater Opportunity, was published this past June. Among them are special programs and procedures to raise the level of academic achievement of the pupils, expansion and improvement of guidance services, the development of a highly successful Higher Horizons program which aims to compensate for cultural limitations of children of all levels of ability, assignment of additional teachers with consequent reduction of class size, increased and improved remedial instruction, improvement of physical school facilities, and others.

In addition to these measures, many pupils in overcrowded schools have been transferred with their parent's consent to under-utilized schools, and in this process some integration was achieved. From 1957 to 1960, almost 30,000 pupils have been shifted for better utilization and, in most cases, improved integration. Moreover, integration has been one of the factors in the selection of sites for new schools and in all new zoning of schools.

All these measures for better education have been the results of close collaboration between the Board of Education, representatives of the several city-wide and borough parent federations and associations, advisory groups on the implementation of the recommendations of the Commission on Integration, and many other civic-educational groups in the city.

In the past year and a half we have been studying how, in spite of the fact that schools are generally districted, we can institute a program of open enrollment whereby parents of pupils in schools with a heavy concentration of minority groups can be given the opportunity to transfer their children

to schools with unused space and to an educational situation where reasonably varied ethnic distribution exists. The Board of Education is now ready to institute such a program.
.....By this additional step, the public schools of New York City accept the responsibility and obligation for educational leadership in this delicate and crucial area of our social structure. In doing so, we seek to make a significant contribution to our city and our nation.

****

APPENDIX

New Construction 1964 - 1965

Summary of Elementary and Junior High School Projects
Recommended for Construction 1964 - 1965

Elementary Schools

"X"	"Y"	Mid-range
9	5	5

Junior High Schools

"X"	"Y"	Mid-range
3	2	9

It should be noted that new schools are planned for many different reasons. Often the question of the need or significance is omitted. See the Board of Education statement below:

> "The preparation of the proposed school building program...involved a succession of studies and procedures designed to bring into sharp focus the most urgent and pressing school construction needs of each community of the City. In order to gain the clearest possible picture of these needs, the following steps were taken:

XVII.

1. The Education Division through their assistant superintendents were requested to submit in writing to the School Planning and Research Division their specific recommendations for meeting present and future school building needs in local school board districts.

2. Consultations were held with individual assistant superintendents in charge of school districts and special activities to explore in detail the basis of each recommendation submitted.

3. All recommendations were reviewed jointly by the heads of the staffs of the School Planning and Research Sections against the findings in a series of community studies undertaken by the Programming and Research Section of the Division. These studies encompassed:

    a) The division of the City of New York into 76 residential communities subdivided into 347 Health Areas further subdivided into 2,225 Census Tracts.

    b) Compilations for each community of essential statistics including birth data, population changes, changes in ethnic composition, and changes in age distribution.

    c) Projections of school enrollments based on a history of births and school grade survival ratios from 1947 to the present.

    d) Adjustments for th impact of large-scale housing developments.

    e) Adjustments for the effects of non-public schools, bus transportation, and the need for special educational programs.

    f) Computations of existing school capacities and adjustments for new schools under construction, and schools to be surrendered, converted, enlarged and replaced.

4. On the basis of recommendations from the education divisions, consultations with assistant superintendents and analyses of studies made by the Programming Section, the School Planning and Research Division formulated the tentative school building program.

The assignment of rank orders of priority within the various categories of the proposed 1964-1965 building program was made on the basis of the following considerations:

A. The need for schools to serve newly developed communities.

B. The need to relieve existing and anticipated over-crowding of school buildings.

C. The need to replace physically and educationally obsolete school buildings.

D. The need to provide facilities for the improvement and expansion of the educational program.

A review of the 1964-1965 list of school projects shows that nine "newly" segregated elementary and three junior high schools are scheduled to be constructed. This is a serious situation which retards the possibility of complete desegregation.

XIX.

APPENDIX

PROPOSED 1964-1965 SCHOOL BUILDING PROGRAM:
PROJECTS RECOMMENDED FOR CONSTRUCTION

SCHOOL PROJECT	PURPOSE OF PROJECT	% OTHER	TYPE
P-312-K	Add. Capacity Flatlands-Bergen B.	99.9	Y
P-40-K	Replace P-9-X Destroyed by fire South Bronx	4.5	X
P-91-K	Add. Capacity Replace P-70 Bedford-Stuyvesant	*	X
P-5-K	Add. Capacity Replace P-70 Bedford Stuyvesant	*	X
P-149-M	2 bldgs; K-2 & 3-6 Replace P-184 Central Harlem-So.	0.7	X
P-200-M	Add. Capacity Replace P90M Central Harlem No.	00.5	X
J-10-M	Replace J-139* Provide K-6 Cap. Central Harlem-No.	0.5	X
Shore Front H.S. Brooklyn	Add. Capacity	80.0	M
P-328-K	Add. Capacity East New York	*	X
P-327-K	Add. Capacity Brownsville	20.5	M

SCHOOL PROJECT	PURPOSE OF PROJECT	% OTHER	TYPE
J-131-X	Add. Capacity Clason Point	46.2	M
J-55-K	Replace J-6* Provide added capacity Brownsville	1.8	X
P-207-Q	Add. Capacity Howard Beach	*	Y
P-86-Q	Add. Capacity Replace P-170; P-82 Jamaica-So.Jamaica	96.5	Y
P-208-Q	Add. Capacity Replace P-22 Flushing	98.5	Y
J-292-K	Replace J-149 East New York	31.8	M
P-316-K	Replace J-42 Crown Heights	21.4	M
J-281-K	Replace J-128 Gravesend	90.9	Y
J-293-K	Replace J-6 Provide K-6 Capacity South Brooklyn	21.3	M
H.S.- Man. Food & Maritime Trades	Replace existing obsolete building	63.8	M
J-56-M	Replace J-12 Lower East Side	37.1	M
P-321-K	Replace P-77; P-39 Park Slope	68.9	M

SCHOOL PROJECT	PURPOSE OF PROJECT	% OTHER	TYPE
P-104-Q Add.	Add. Capacity Auxiliary Facilities Rockaway	93.2	Y
J-29-M	Add. Capacity Upper East Side	48.1	Y
Northeast Qns. H.S. Queens	Add. Capacity	80.0	M
P-277-K Add.	Add. Capacity Sheepshead Bay	99.9	Y
J-320-K	Add. Capacity Crown Heights	44.8	M
J-155-X	Add. Capacity South Bronx	10.7	X
P-36-M	Add. Capacity Morningside-Manhattanville	21.4	M
P-243-K Add	Add. Capacity Bedford Stuyvesant	1.9	X
P-84-X	Add. Capacity Morrisania	*	X
P-56-K	Add. Capacity Bedford Stuyvesant	37.1	M
P-157-X	Add. Capacity South Bronx	3.9	X
J-144-X	Add. Capacity Williamsbridge	93.4	Y
New Academic H.S. Richmond	Add. Capacity	94.1	Y

SCHOOL PROJECT	PURPOSE OF PROJECT	% OTHER	TYPE
J-88-K	Park Slope Provide K-6 Capacity Replace J-10*	73.5	M
P-622-M	Replacement existing obsolete Bldg.	Non-available	
Jamaica Voc. H.S. Queens	Replace existing obsolete building	75.3	M
T. Roosevelt H.S. Bronx Renovation	Reconstruction of Elec./San.Systems	72.4	M
Jamaica H.S. Qns. Renovation	Reconstruction of Elec./San.Systems	89.9	Y
Richmond Hill H.S. Queens Renovation	Reconstruction of Elec./San.Systems	94.1	Y
Port Richmond H.S. Richmond Addition	Auxiliary Facilities	91.0	Y
J-210-Q	Add. Capacity Woodhaven	78.5	M

*No specific ethnic composition estimates available.

---

[1] SCHOOL PLANNING AND RESEARCH DIVISION, Proposed 1964-1965 School Building Program, Prepared for Public Hearing Document, June 1963, Board of Education, City of New York

APPENDIX

These X Schools are lacking:
a Centralized School Library Facility: (1962)

P 42K
47K
125K
137K

P 4X
20X
23X

P 103M
113M
157M
170M

P 36Q
48Q
92Q
110Q
160Q

These X Schools are lacking:
a School Auditorium: (1962)

P 24K
47K
129K
138K
150K
150K

P 4X
20X
124X
146X

P 24M
31M
39M
57M
103M
156M
157M

P 15Q
48Q
110Q

At P39M the assembly hall consists of four large rooms with rolling partitions; these are used as classrooms.

These X Schools are lacking:
Shower Facilities for Use: (1962)

P 2X
4X
9X
18X
23X
25X
27X
30X
37X
39X

These X Schools are lacking:
a School Gymnasium: (1962)

P 7K
24K
42K
87K
125K
129K
147K

P 9X
54X
124X

P 31M
39M
57M
103M
107M
156M
157M

P 15Q
36Q
48Q
92Q
110Q

1962 Survey data of (National Inventory of P.S. : N.Y.C.)
These X Schools are lacking:
a School Cafeteria or Lunch Room
for Teachers and Students:

P 54K
93K
138K
144K
257K
287K
304K
305K

P 4X
20X
23X
25X
30X
54X
62X
66X
154X

P 4M
24M
39M
156M
161M
171M

P 15Q
45Q
110Q
118Q
160Q

FROM HIGHER HORIZONS PROGRESS REPORT 1963

TEACHER EDUCATION

Preceding chapters have set forth the goals of the Higher Horizons Program, and the special services supplied to assist in the achievement of these goals. The present chapter and those which follow present in considerable detail the techniques, procedures, and practices which have actually been used in the schools, together with the basic considerations underlying their use.

These chapters are descriptive rather than evaluative. They tell the story of what was done, and why. The methods are quite different from those of scientific research and the judgments admittedly subjective. Yet they are by far the most important part of this report.

Here will be found the record of the bread-and-butter activities designed to raise achievement levels, and the inspirational activities designed to raise levels of aspiration and hope. Actually, of course, the record is necessarily incomplete. No single document, regardless of size, could possibly include all of the Higher Horizons schools which might lead to the attainment of the objectives. Brief as it is, it will, we hope, indicate both the extent and the nature of the program.

CENTRAL ROLE OF THE TEACHER

The teacher is the key figure in the total process of educational change. He himself must first believe in the child and in the program; he must be the first to catch the contagion of enthusiasm. Faced with the daily demands of a difficult situation, the teacher, often new and inexperienced, may tend to lose sight of the reservoir of potential which exists in all children. A program such as Higher Horizons can be successful only if it stimulates the faith of teachers in pupils, and then makes it possible for them to translate that faith into reality.

Therefore, a major part of the Higher Horizons effort has consisted of the training and re-training of teachers. Throughout the city, program teachers have given more time to the training of new teachers than to any other single activity.

ACTIVITIES OF PROGRAM TEACHERS

In one district, teams of curriculum experts serviced all new elementary teachers, on a rotating basis. In another district, program teachers led groups and science clubs. They may be taken for granted in suburbia, but for us they represent a distinct breakthrough in our own educational frontier.

It is an unfortunate fact of existence in many schools located in blighted urban areas that the normal processes of education become more difficult of achievement, and more wearing upon personnel. As a result, there is often neither time nor energy left for the many "extras" which teachers wish to do, and which normally accompany their regular professional activities.

The psychological rewards of helping children with special needs are great indeed, and we shall never have enough of the teacher whose greatest reward is a psychic increment. In New York City we have our fair share, and more, of those dedicated men and women who, in their daily labor of love for children, give unstintingly of themselves over and beyond the call of duty. All of us remember with fondness and gratitude the teachers who, under the most difficult of circumstances, and the strength of personality, have mixed love and learning to raise aspirations and achievement of children.

Such teachers are by their very nature, few, and it is unrealistic to expect that our urban schools and particularly the ones in the "gray areas" will receive more of them than other schools. Laments about the changed attitudes of teachers and strictures about the necessity of dedication tend to over look the many additional burdens of teachers in schools in blighted areas: The prevading and corrosive problems of discipline; with their threats to the self-esteem of the teacher; the defferential set of values and expectations between the school and the community; the high transiency rate of the pupil population; the high rate of staff turnover; the large number of in-migrants; the difficulties of securing parental support and reinforcement; the greater travel time to and from school; and many others.

The additional services supplied in keeping with the principle of compensatory education make it possible for schools to conduct those activities which they always desired, but could not carry on because of lack of staff or strength. Ultimately it is hoped that, in terms of activities, academic achievement, and climate, there will be little difference between Higher Horizons schools and other schools throughout the city.

XXVII.

APPENDIX

Board of Examiners of the Board of Education

110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn 1, New York

Progress Report of the Board of Examiners 1962-1963

(Public Statement)

Following the issuance of the joint report of the Board of Superintendents and the Board of Examiners entitled Staffing Our Schools Today and Tomorrow, in December 1961, the Board of Examiners proceeded to put into effect a number of changes in its selection procedure, as follows:

1. The route to a license as teacher has been facilitated. The examination for a regular license consists generally of an interview, a short-answer test of scholarship (which is machine scored), and a composition rated for written English. Applicants have been examined early in their senior year in college so that the Board of Education has been in a position to compete with surrounding communities by offering candidates jobs months before their graduation.

From September 1, 1962 to May 1, 1963 the Board of Examiners has issued in record time 3,300 licenses as regular teacher in 63 subjects. Among these are the following:

Title of License	Date of Written Test	Date of Eligible Lists	Number Licensed
Common Branches - in elementary schools	10/29/62	1/23/63	1,408
Early Childhood	10/29/62	1/23/63	297
English - Junior High Schools	11/15/62	2/27/63	123
Social Studies - Junior High Schools	11/23/62	2/27/63	185

2. The Board of Examiners is also engaged in examining for regular license more than 5,000 experienced substitute teachers who were granted a special examination by the State Legislature in 1962. As a result there will be a substantial increase in the percentage of regular teachers serving in the schools.
3. The Board of Examiners now allows applicants who show strength in one test to compensate for some inadequacies in another test by achieving a passing average in the examination as a whole.
4. The licensing of substitute teachers has been facilitated by permitting the filing of applications at any time, by giving examinations frequently, and by streamlining the selection procedures to an interview and a composition rated for written English. The time required from application to licensing, ranges from ten days to six weeks, depending upon the needs of the schools. From July 1, 1962, to May 1, 1963 approximately 9,332 such licenses were issued.

In addition, whenever, a principal was unable to secure a licensed teacher for an immediate vacancy, and he made a request for an emergency examination, his request was given priority and the application was processed immediately. A summer testing program was conducted in 1962 to provide teachers at the beginning of the school year for unanticipated openings. An expanded summer program will be conducted this year.

5. While instituting these innovations, the Board of Examiners has processed a total of 34,000 applications (a new record--24,500 last year) for all types of teaching and supervisory service this year.
6. The Board of Examiners has urged broader teacher recruitment efforts and the giving of examinations in selected centers outside of New York City. As a beginning, it suggested the Washington D.C. area, and the Board sent a representative to visit colleges in that vicinity with the assistant superintendent in charge of teacher recruitment in order to plan tests for the fall.
7. During the month of April, teams of examiners made visits to Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and Detroit, (Chicago is also to be visited) to learn at first hand more about their selection procedures. As an outcome of these visits the Board of Examiners expects, before the fall to introduce additional innovations in the selection of teachers and supervisors.

XXX.

While reporting progress in its effort to meet the school policy direction of the Board of Education and the superintendent of schools, the Board of Examiners feels obliged to point out the following:

1. The elimination from examinations for teaching licenses of such instruments of appraisal as the teaching test and the essay test in scholarship and education. When taken in conjunction with the generous time extensions granted by the Board of Education for meeting eligibility requirements means the beginning teachers now need a more sustained program of supervision and that the probationary period must be utilized more effectively by the responsible supervising officers.
2. The changes in selection procedures described above are regarded as experimental by the Board of Examiners. The professional staff should assess the results in order to be sure that our new teachers meet appropriate standards.
3. A still unsolved problem is the reluctance of new teachers to accept appointments or assignments to schools that they regard as difficult. It has been stated that our personnel problem is one of distribution, rather than supply. As in the past, the Board of Examiners stands ready to cooperate with the responsible authorities in finding an adequate solution to this problem.

May 8, 1963 BOARD OF EXAMINERS

XXXI.

APPENDIX

URBAN LEAGUE STATEMENT ON OPEN ENROLLMENT

WHAT ARE THE ADVANTAGES OF TRANSFERRING YOUR CHILD TO AN INTEGRATED SCHOOL?

1. Children trained in the best traditions of democracy make the best citizens of democracy. The opportunity to know and associate with children of other backgrounds as equals will help youngsters to lose feelings of inferiority or superiority.

2. Children in integrated schools will find it easier to develop a better appreciation of themselves as human beings - born free and equal - with the same equal rights and privileges as are granted all human beings.

3. Children's life objectives will be enlarged and broadened by their daily contact with youngsters of different backgrounds and a variety of interests and goals. At the same time, a desire for more education may be stimulated.

4. Children will be going into schools that are not crowded, or on double or part-time sessions.

5. Children educated in segregated schools tend to develop prejudices which block creativity. Such prejudices are harmful to white as well as Negro and other minority group youngsters.

The elimination of school segregation in New York City is a job for school authorities, parents and the total community.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
NUMBER OF PUPILS
1962

ETHNIC	CITY-WIDE	MANHATTAN	BRONX	BROOKLYN	QUEENS	RICHMOND
TOTAL	573,122	101,553	108,079	213,402	129,823	20,265
NEGRO	150,195	41,405	24,054	59,355	23,585	1,730
PUERTO RICAN	106,768	35,804	31,838	36,133	2,585	408
OTHER	316,159	24,344	52,187	117,914	103,587	18,127
			1961			
TOTAL	567,613	101,931	105,614	209,409	129,890	20,769
NEGRO	141,061	40,764	22,295	54,044	22,247	1,711
PUERTO RICAN	101,813	35,850	29,664	33,381	2,511	407
OTHER	324,739	25,317	53,655	121,984	105,132	18,651
			1961-62 PERCENTAGE CHANGE			
TOTAL	+1.0	-0.4	+2.3	+1.9	-0.1	-2.4
NEGRO	+6.5	+1.6	+7.9	+9.8	+6.3	+1.1
PUERTO RICAN	+4.9	-0.1	+7.3	+8.2	+2.9	+0.2
OTHER	-2.6	-3.8	-2.7	-3.3	-1.5	-2.8

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS
NUMBER OF PUPILS
1962

ETHNIC	CITY-WIDE	MANHATTAN	BRONX	BROOKLYN	QUEENS	RICHMOND
TOTAL	186,113	34,991	38,998	69,263	40,725	2,136
NEGRO	44,009	13,092	7,794	16,811	6,147	165
PUERTO RICAN	33,974	12,303	10,431	10,415	783	42
OTHER	108,130	9,596	20,773	42,037	33,795	1,929

1961

TOTAL	185,479	35,329	38,656	69,480	40,500	1,514
NEGRO	39,778	13,033	6,376	14,756	5,496	117
PUERTO RICAN	32,342	12,138	9,798	9,626	742	38
OTHER	113,359	10,158	22,482	45,098	34,262	1,359

PERCENTAGE CHANGE

TOTAL	+0.3	-1.0	+0.9	-0.3	+0.6	+41.1
NEGRO	+10.6	+0.5	+22.2	+13.9	+11.8	+41.0
PUERTO RICAN	+5.0	+1.4	+6.5	+8.2	+5.5	+10.5
OTHER	-416	-515	-7.6	-6.8	-1.4	+41.9

Special Census of School Population - Composition of Register
Elementary Schools Distribution by Borough
October 31, 1962*

	Number of Pupils				Per Cent of Total Register			
Borough	Puerto Rican	Negro	Others	Total	Puerto Rican	Negro	Others	Total
Manhattan	35,053	41,579	23,617	100,249	35.0	41.5	23.5	100.0
Bronx	34,119	26,208	50,662	110,989	30.7	23.6	45.7	100.0
Brooklyn	39,062	64,278	116,254	219,549	17.8	29.3	52.9	100.0
Queens	2,653	24,920	108,659	130,232	2.0	19.1	78.9	100.0
Richmond	408	1,785	18,498	20,619	2.0	8.6	89.4	100.0
Total	11,295	158,770	311,690	581,775	19.1	27.3	53.6	100.0

October 31, 1957

	Number of Pupils				Per Cent of Total Register			
Borough	Puerto Rican	Negro	Others	Total	Puerto Rican	Negro	Others	Total
Manhattan	35,053	36,829	31,669	103,094	33.6	35.7	30.7	100.0
Bronx	34,596	17,606	61,904	102,721	22.6	17.1	60.3	100.0
Brooklyn	24,423	41,939	133,383	199,745	12.2	21.0	66.8	100.0
Queens	2,108	15,875	109,932	127,915	1.6	12.1	85.9	100.0
Richmond	357	1,495	19,092	20,944	1.7	7.1	91.2	100.0
TOTAL	84,695	112,744	355,980	554,419	15.3	20.5	64.2	100.0

Appendix

Survey of "X"-"Y" and Mid-Range Schools - June 1, 1963

Category	"X"	"Y"	Mid-Range	Total	Elem.S.	J.H.S.	H.S.	"600"s	Total
I. Schools Presently Under Construction	10	10	6	26	16	9	1	0	26
II. Schools Awaiting Start of Construction "600" Schools not included	16	14	18	48*	33	11	4	2	50
III. Schools being Modernized, Converted or Receiving an Addition	2	12	13	27	11	2	14	1	28
IV. Proposed Schools - 1963-4 Capital Budget for Advanced Planning and/or Site Selection	14	16	20	51	25	16	10	0	51
V. Buildings Getting Temporary Classrooms	11	6	17	34	33	0	1	0	34
VI. Additional Classroom Program Within Existing Schools	17	16	34	67	51	11	5	0	67
VII. Schools Completed Since June 1959	16	22	7	45	36	8	2	0	45

1. Central Zoning Unit, Board of Education

PERCENTAGES OF "X", "Y" AND MID-RANGE SCHOOLS TO THE NUMBER OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS CITY-WIDE AND BOROUGH-WIDE

	Number of Schools		
School Organizations	1960 - 1961	1961 - 1962	1962 - 1963
CITY-WIDE - "X"	94/571 = 16.5%	102/573 = 17.8%	118/578 = 20.4%
"Y"	237/571 = 41.5%	215/573 = 37.5%	198/578 = 34.3%
Mid-Range	240/571 = 42.0%	256/573 = 44.7%	262/578 = 45.3%
Manhattan - "X"	35/96 = 36.5%	35/97 = 36.1%	38/97 = 39.2%
"Y"	6/96 = 6.2%	3/97 = 3.1%	3/97 = 3.1%
Mid-Range	55/96 = 57.3%	59/97 = 60.8%	56/97 = 57.7%
Bronx - "X"	16/93 = 17.2%	18/97 = 18.6%	26/100 = 26.0%
"Y"	23/93 = 24.7%	20/97 = 20.6%	16/100 = 16.0%
Mid-Range	54/93 = 58.1%	59/97 = 60.8%	58/100 = 58.0%
Brooklyn - "X"	32/192 = 16.7%	38/191 = 19.9%	41/193 = 21.2%
"Y"	79/192 = 41.1%	70/191 = 36.6%	67/193 = 34.7%
Mid-Range	81/192 = 42.2%	83/191 = 43.5%	85/193 = 44.1%
Queens - "X"	11/158 = 7.0%	11/156 = 7.1%	13/156 = 8.3%
"Y"	107/158 = 67.7%	100/156 = 64.1%	91/156 = 58.3%
Mid-Range	40/158 = 25.3%	45/156 = 28.8%	52/156 = 33.4%
Richmond - "X"	0/32 = 0.0%	0/32 = 0.0%	0/32 = 0.0%
"Y"	22/32 = 68.8%	22/32 = 68.8%	21/32 = 65.6%
Mid-Range	10/32 = 31.2%	10/32 = 31.2%	11/32 = 34.4%

Note: "X" Elementary School - 90% or more Negro and/or Puerto Rican

"Y" Elementary School - 90% or more "OTHERS"

Special Census of School Population - Composition of Register
Elementary Schools Distribution by Borough
October 31, 1962

35,053

Borough	Number of Pupils				Per Cent of Total Register			
	Puerto Rican	Negro	Others	Total	Puerto Rican	Negro	Others	Total
Manhattan	35,053	41,579	23,617	100,249	35.0	41.5	23.5	100.0
Bronx	34,119	26,208	50,662	110,989	30.7	23.6	45.7	100.0
Brooklyn	39,062	64,278	116,254	219,594	17.8	29.3	52.9	100.0
Queens	2,653	24,920	108,659	130,232	2.0	19.1	78.9	100.0
Richmond	408	1,785	18,498	20,691	2.0	8.6	89.4	100.0
Total	111,295	158,770	311,690	581,755	19.1	27.3	53.6	100.0

October 31, 1957

Borough	Puerto Rican	Negro	Others	Total	Puerto Rican	Negro	Others	Total
Manhattan	35,053	36,829	31,669	103,094	33.6	35.7	30.7	100.0
Bronx	34,596	17,606	61,904	102,721	22.6	17.1	60.3	100.0
Brooklyn	24,423	41,939	133,383	199,745	12.2	21.0	66.8	100.0
Queens	2,108	15,875	109,932	127,915	1.6	12.1	85.9	100.0
Richmond	357	1,495	19,092	20,944	1.7	7.1	91.2	100.0
Total	84,695	113,744	355,980	554,419	15.3	20.5	64.2	100.0

Special Census of School Population - Composition of Register City-Wide by School Group

October 31, 1962

	Number of Pupils				Per Cent of Total Register			
	Puerto Rican	Negro	Others	Total	Puerto Rican	Negro	Others	Total
Elementary	111,292	158,770	311,690	581,755	19.1	27.3	53.6	100.0
Junior High	35,071	49,667	108,555	193,293	18.1	25.7	56.2	100.0
Special Schools	1,750	2,311	2,125	6,186	28.4	37.8	33.8	100.0
All Schools[1]	169,493	246,336	611,599	1,027,428	16.5	24.0	59.5	100.0

October 31, 1961

	Number of Pupils				Per Cent of Total Register			
	Puerto Rican	Negro	Others	Total	Puerto Rican	Negro	Other	Total
Elementary	106,768	150,195	316,159	573,122	18.6	26.2	55.2	100.0
Junior High	33,974	44,009	108,130	186,113	18.3	23.6	58.1	100.0
Special Schools	1,824	2,310	2,132	6,266	29.1	36.9	34.0	100.0
All Schools[1]	162,235	228,592	613,438	1,004,265	16.1	22.8	61.1	100.0

---

[1] Includes Academic and Vocational High Schools Registers.

Special Census of School Population - Composition of Register
Junior High Schools - Distribution of Schools
According to Per Cent of Puerto Rican, Negro, and Others
October 31, 1962

Per Cent Interval	Puerto Rican		Negro		Others		Puerto Rican and Negro[a]	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-
0.1 -4.9	61	46	21	16	12	9	16	12
5.0 -9.9	11	8	21	15	7	5	15	11
10.0-14.9	10	8	18	14	9	7	11	8
15.0-19.9	6	5	15	11	3	2	8	6
20.0-24.9	3	2	13	10	5	4	9	7
25.0-29.9	6	5	9	7	1	1	3	2
30.0-34.9	3	2	3	2	4	3	6	5
35.0-39.9	2	2	4	3	3	2	4	3
40.0-44.9	7	5	4	3	5	4	3	2
45.0-49.9	3	2	3	2	6	5	-	-
50.0-54.9	7	5	3	2	-	-	6	5
55.0-59.9	5	4	2	2	3	2	5	4
60.0-65.9	4	3	2	2	4	3	3	2
65.0-69.9	1	1	2	2	6	5	4	3
70.0-74.9	2	2	1	1	3	2	1	1
75.0-79.9	-	-	1	1	8	6	5	4
80.0-84.9	-	-	1	1	9	7	3	2
85.0-89.9	-	-	1	1	11	8	9	7
90.0-94.9	-	-	3	2	15	11	7	5
95.0-99.9	-	-	4	3	16	13	12	10
100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Total	131	100	131	100	131	100	131	100

---

[a] This column is based on the combined number of Negro and Puerto Rican pupils in each school.

Special Census of School Population-Composition of Register Trend in Distribution of Pupils Enrolled by School Level

Fall 1957-1962[1]

	Number of Pupils				Per Cent of Total Register			
	Puerto Rican	Negro	Others	Total	Puerto Rican	Negro	Others	Total
Elementary								
1957	83,648	112,309	354,400	550,357	15.2	20.4	64.4	100.0
1958	91,098	122,416	345,235	558,749	16.3	21.9	61.8	100.0
1959	96,991	130,942	329,226	557,159	17.4	23.5	59.1	100.0
1960	101,813	141,061	324,739	567,613	17.9	24.9	57.2	100.0
1961	106,768	150,195	316,159	573,122	18.6	26.2	55.2	100.0
1962	111,295	158,770	311,690	581,775	19.1	27.3	53.6	100.0
Junior High								
1957	27,167	31,980	109,976	169,123	16.1	18.9	65.0	100.0
1958	27,484	32,337	112,465	172,286	16.0	18.7	65.3	100.0
1959	30,068	35,812	120,715	186,595	16.1	19.2	64.7	100.0
1960	32,342	39,778	113,359	185,479	17.4	21.4	61.2	100.0
1961	33,974	49,667	108,130	186,113	18.3	23.6	58.1	100.0
1962	35,071	49,667	108,555	193,293	18.1	25.7	56.2	100.0
All Schools								
1957	128,980	172,957	650,680	952,617	13.5	18.2	68.3	100.0
1958	137,074	184,985	645,806	967,865	14.2	19.0	66.8	100.0
1959	146,432	197,517	633,582	977,531	15.0	20.2	64.8	100.0
1960	153,697	212,006	620,976	986,679	15.6	21.5	62.9	100.0
1961	162,235	228,592	613,438	1,004,265	16.1	22.8	61.1	100.0
1962	169,493	246,336	611,599	1,027,428	16.5	24.0	9.5	100.0

[1] Data for 1957 are as of September 30. Data for other years are as of October 31.

Special Census of School Population - Composition of Register
Day Elementary Schools - Distribution of Schools
According to Per Cent of Puerto Rican, Negro, and Others
October 31, 1962

Per Cent Interval	Puerto Rican		Negro		Others		Puerto Rican and Negro[a]	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	30	5	50	8	5	1	15	2
0.1- 4.9	284	48	135	24	79	14	148	26
5.0- 9.9	60	10	71	12	33	6	44	7
10.0-14.9	20	4	59	10	29	5	36	6
15.0-19.9	32	6	50	8	15	2	26	4
20.0-24.9	17	3	40	7	13	2	26	4
25.0-29.9	16	3	21	4	11	2	24	4
30.0-34.9	15	2	22	4	17	3	11	2
35.0-39.9	17	3	15	2	7	1	11	2
40.0-44.9	6	1	13	2	9	2	15	2
45.0-49.9	17	3	20	3	10	2	7	1
50.0-54.9	14	2	3	1	8	1	11	2
55.0-59.9	12	2	13	2	15	2	8	1
60.0-64.9	14	2	6	1	11	2	7	1
65.0-69.9	13	2	7	1	11	2	17	3
70.0-74.9	11	2	6	1	24	4	12	2
75.0-79.9	8	1	7	1	25	4	13	2
80.0-84.9	6	1	7	1	27	5	15	2
85.0-89.9	-	-	9	2	35	6	29	5
90.0-94.9	-	-	11	2	42	7	32	6
95.0-99.9	-	-	26	4	151	25	79	15
100.0	-	-	1	-	15	2	6	1
Total	592	100	592	100	592	100	592	100

[a] This column is based on the combined number of Negro and Puerto Rican pupils in each school.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Research Study of the Urban League of Greater New York pointed out the great gap in reading and arithmetic level scores between children attending "Y" schools and those attending "X" schools. This gap has remained unchanged since the Public Education Association report of 1955. These results can only be caused by known variations in environmental opportunities and stimulation and can not be interpreted in terms of differences in the educability of Negro and Puerto Rican children.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Urban League of Greater New York strongly recommends that the Board of Education prepare and execute a master plan designed to integrate all schools and, at the same time, to raise achievement levels in all schools.
2. The Urban League of Greater New York recommends that the Board of Education take full responsibility for the assignment of pupils and teachers for the execution of the master plan for integration.

I. RAISING THE LEVEL OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

The Urban League of Greater New York recommends that:

1) the Board of Education provide a stronger guidance program which will encourage and enable pupils of varying backgrounds to attain high academic achievement levels;

2) the Board of Education continue its progressive policy of establishing school-based experimental projects such as study and cultural centers; and that it broaden its work in this area by setting

up similar projects in strategically located school evening centers (e.g., seven in Harlem, seven in Brooklyn, six in Bronx, four in Queens) basically aimed at the involvement of those youths, who by dropping out of school, are in danger of becoming culturally, educationally and economically "depressed" as well as "deprived" of the opportunity to function as useful, constructive components of our society;

3) the Board of Education initiate a series of programs adapted to individual elementary schools, including two or three supplementary classes in reading, English skills, and mathematics (where it is necessary to lighten the school day and to pay teachers for extra hours this should be done);

4) each elementary school prepare a syllabus for reading (general improvements), language arts, English skills and mathematics, science and social studies, with curriculum and tutoring suggestions for parents, agencies, and groups such as the Fordham Catholic Interracial Council and th Harlem Educational Tutorial Project;

5) there be an immediate concentrated city-wid effort to develop text books which realistically rflect the contributions of the varied ethnic grous in American society;

6) the New York City public school system should review intelligence testing policies to insure that Negroes and Puerto Rican children have equality of opportunity in the school learning programs.

II. PHYSICAL FACILITIES

The Urban League of Greater New York recommends that:

1) the Board of education continue to modernize and repair school buildings located in predominantly Negro and Puerto Rican areas;

2) the Board of Education should make special efforts to incorporate the newest educational design features in all buildings which are constructed in congested areas.

III. SCHOOL STAFFING AND PERSONNEL

The Urban League of Greater New York strongly recommends that:

1) Negro and Puerto Rican teachers be given additional positions which provide experiences helpful in preparing for administrative licensing requirements;

2) the racial imbalance of regularly licensed teachers in all de facto segregated schools be corrected as soon as possible;

3) the Bureau of Teacher Recruitment of New York City Public schools in cooperation with the Board of Examiners expand with imagination and intensity their present recruitment efforts of out of city testing programs to secure more Negro and Puerto Rican personnel from southern colleges and

non-urban centers;

4) that the Board of Education expand the program for practice teachers so that, first, practice teachers will be encouraged to train in schools where Negro and Puerto Rican children are predominantly enrolled; and second, Negro and Puerto Rican practice teachers will work in schools which have a high ratio of white children;

5) the position master teacher be developed for the training and orientation of newly assigned and experienced teachers working in different schools;

6) the elimination of all proposals for bonus or "combat" pay for teachers in "hard to staff" schools;

7) "in service training" courses in urban sociology social class structure and differentiation, and racial attitudes be required of all teachers, principals and supervisors in the school system, new and experienced, substitute and regular.

IV. ZONING AND INTEGRATION

The Urban League of Greater New York recommends that:

1) the Central Zoning Unit be given additional staff members and more authority to determine overall zone lines;

2) more creative ways of zoning be developed

including utilization, open enrollment, the use of feeder patterns, (Princeton Plan), additional high school zoning variances, cross districting, cross bussing of white children into heavily populated Negro and Puerto Rican schools, and broader use of all means of public transportation;

3) zoning for total integration be started immediately in accordance with a master plan which will include long range features such as educational parks;*

4) total integration of all junior high schools must be undertaken by September 1964;

5) although this report does not deal specifically with the vocational, academic, and special high schools, all high schools, not requiring tests, must be immediately rezoned in so far as is practicable to provide maximum integration.

V. EDUCATION STIMULATION PROGRAM

The Urban League of Greater New York recommends that:

1) steps be taken to strengthen the Higher Horizons program;

(a) An immediate increase in budget to strengthen the program and to eliminate basic weaknesses in the program in individual schools; (b) the addition of supplementary funds to the program each year until it becomes in actuality a demonstration guidance project for all students; (c) the strengthening of the authority of the coordinating consultants of the current Higher Horizons programs; and (d) a research evaluation of all aspects of the Higher Horizons programs.

---

*Proposal by Dr. Max Wolf at Conference on Interation in the New York City Public Schools convened by Urban League of Greater New York, June 1963.

2) the Board of Education accept increased responsibility for the problems of young people who drop out of school and that supportive and constructive programs be developed to encourage more young people to secure their high school diplomas.

VI. SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS

The Urban League of Greater New York recommends that:

1) the Board of Education utilize the talents, skills and knowledge of existing local organizations and agencies in the intergroup relations field to accelerate efforts to complete integration of all public schools;

2) the Board of Education expand its informal adult educational programs in each local school district so that local communities will be able to identify, study, and solve problems concerning school integration;

3) the Board of Education, in order to implement the integration programs, make determined efforts to secure additional funds from city, state, and private sources.

INFORMATION RETRIEVAL CENTER ON THE DISADVANTAGED
Ferkauf Graduate School of Education, Yeshiva Univers